DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 252 SP 034 283

AUTHOR Anderson, C. Raymond, Ed.
TITLE Voices of Change: A Report of the Clinical Schools Project.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y. Education and Research Div.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89333-100-7
PUB DATE Jan 93
NOTE 77p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036 ($15).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Clinical Supervision (of Teachers); *College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; *Educational Change; Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Personal Narratives; *Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teaching; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Educators; Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS *Ford Foundation Clinical Supervision Program; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

The Ford Foundation Clinical Schools Project was designed to assist higher education institutions, school systems, and teachers' professional organizations to collaborate in creating for teacher education the equivalent of the medical profession's teaching hospitals. Seven sites implemented experimental clinical training programs in six states: Florida, Kentucky, Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington. The project descriptions in this report provide names of the participating agencies and schools, numbers of interns served and length of field service, and statements that highlight the general focus of each projects's involvement in the clinical practice component of preservice teacher education. Also outlined are selection criteria for selecting school sites, clinical trainers, and interns; provision of a training component for clinical trainers and preservice teachers; and evaluation and documentation activities. The voices of teachers, student teachers and interns, school and college/university faculty, and administrators are heard in: reflections on feedback to interns; the multiple aspects of diversity in school settings; the impact of the project on professional roles, institutional barriers to collaboration, and communication within and among institutions; contributions to the knowledge base for teaching and the school curriculum; and results and recommendations that emerged from the project. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353252

VOICES *of* CHANGE

A Report of the Clinical Schools Project

C. RAYMOND ANDERSON, EDITOR

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Long

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

GP 034 283

VOICES *of* CHANGE

A Report of the Clinical Schools Project

C. RAYMOND ANDERSON, EDITOR

January 1993

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
Phone 202/293-2450 ■ Fax 202/457-8095

Publication of this document was supported in part by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, nor does AACTE endorse or warrant this information. AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The authors were encouraged to express their judgments freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of *Voices of Change: A Report of the Clinical Schools Project* may be ordered from:
AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186

Single copy price: $15.00

Copyright 1992 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

International Standard Book Number: 0-89333-100-7

CONTENTS

Contributors v
Preface
by Edward J. Meade vii
Introduction
by David G. Imig 1
A Superintendent's View of Public Schools
and Professional Development Centers
by Richard W. Clark 3
Shared Characteristics of Clinical Settings 4
Proposed Partners Express Reservations 4
Urgency of Task 5
Action Needed 6
An Orientation to the Clinical Schools Project
by Martha Mead 7
Phase One: Planning Grants 7
Phase Two: Implementation 8
Profiles of Seven Clinical Sites 8
Overview of Planning and Implementation 11
The Participants' Voices: Observations, Experiences,
and Results from the Clinical Schools Project 15
Nature and Results of Feedback to Interns 16
Multiple Aspects of Diversity 18
Impact on Professional Roles 21
Impact on Communication 24
Contribution to the Knowledge Base of Teaching 28
Contribution to the School Curriculum 30
Impact on Institutional Barriers 32
Results and Recommendations. 35
Messages from the Collected Voices
by C. Raymond Anderson 40
References 46
Appendix A: Project Participants. 47
Appendix B: Site Descriptions 49
Dade County, Florida 49
Jefferson County, Kentucky 52
Gorham, Maine 56

New York City 59
Rochester, New York 60
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 64
Seattle, Washington 66
Appendix C: Clinical Schools Clearinghouse 69

CONTRIBUTORS

C. RAYMOND ANDERSON, editor for this volume, is associate dean *emeritus* of the College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park.

RICHARD W. CLARK is superintendent, Bellevue, Washington, School District.

DAVID G. IMIG is chief executive officer of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

MARTHA MEAD, is clinical schools project director for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

EDWARD J. MEADE is a consultant to the Ford Foundation.

PREFACE

Through the ages, the key to schools has been and continues to be the teachers. With this in mind, the nation needs always to support and concentrate on its teachers—who they are, how they are educated and trained, under what conditions and with what resources they need to work, and how they can continue to develop as professionals, as pedagogues, and as persons.

Today, an increased amount of attention is being paid to teachers. For example, efforts are underway nationally to encourage and recruit more and more able persons into teaching—whether as a beginning career or as a midcareer option. There are also efforts to raise standards of performance for both entry into the profession and for those already teaching in the nation's schools.

Another area of considerable activity is that of the preparation of new teachers, namely, how and about what they should be educated both in the general sense and about particular matters, and in what and how they should be trained and subsequently inducted into the profession of teaching, in schools. It was this latter point that in 1988 attracted the attention of the Ford Foundation in its continuing support of teachers and teacher education that began in the 1950s. Back then, the Foundation gave $30 million to support efforts toward improving teacher education programs, which subsequently led to the Master of Arts in Teaching. Following that effort, which ran well into the 1960s, the Ford Foundation turned to support of activities to recruit and prepare more minorities for teaching. Later, at the end of the 1970s and through much of the 1980s, with the decline of students in the schools, the Foundation diverted its interest in teacher preparation to issues and programs on behalf of practicing teachers and to their further professional development. But, then, as the '80s were coming to a close, and as enrollments in schools were growing once again and the supply of new teachers had dwindled, the Foundation returned its attention to the preparation of new teachers.

Initially, the Foundation focused on the one aspect of teacher preparation that is found in almost any teacher education program, namely, clinical practice. Surprisingly, it is a part of teacher preparation that, at present, is receiving relatively less attention than, for example, standards for admission into teacher education programs, the content of professional courses, and exit examinations. It is all the more surprising that, at this time, when school-college collaboration is being stressed, that this aspect of teacher preparation has been largely ignored. Clearly, it is an activity which, by its very nature, calls for these institutions to work together.

What the Ford Foundation sought in its program of support was to assist higher education institutions, school systems, and the professional organizations that represent teachers to create teacher education's equivalent of medicine's teaching

hospitals. These three partners were sought out because each plays a role in preparing teachers. The college or university has the responsibility for academic preparation, the schools for clinical preparation, and the teacher organizations for determining the standards of the profession. The hope was that, collectively, these partners would plan and develop clinical practice for teacher interns that would

- take place in public schools where the schools and school systems formally agreed to accept responsibility for such training.
- take place in public schools that reflect the changing demography of students.
- take place in public schools that accept at least a dual function—if not the integration—of development of teachers and instruction for students.
- take place in public schools that are already engaged in improving their own instructional capacities, and that employ a variety of sound pedagogical practices.
- take place over a sustained period, preferably a full school year.
- reflect more responsibility for selected and trained "clinical" teachers in the schools, with the college or university supporting and working collaboratively with clinical teachers.

The Foundation further hoped that the clinical-school phase of teacher preparation would be the place for formal work methods, or more precisely, pedagogy, and that it would involve cadres of teacher interns in the schools. These cadres of teaching interns would be large enough both to reinforce the concept of the school as a clinical site, and to enable interns to learn from one another as well as from clinical teachers. From a professional development perspective, during this important phase of teacher preparation, the teacher interns would be considered a part of the school's instructional staff and would be paid for their services.

In addition, the Foundation granted funds to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) to enable persons from seven clinical sites to meet regularly and exchange information, share ideas, and lend assistance. AACTE also published a quarterly newsletter on clinical practice, began building a data base, and started collecting materials on the clinical phase of teacher education and induction. AACTE established a national advisory committee for this program to assist in the professional development of project personnel, to review progress of the projects, and to glean any general findings or results as these projects mature.

This monograph is the first public expression of what has been learned in these early starts at clinical schools. Clearly, this is not the last word or final lesson. Instead, what follows is a window through which readers can view the experiences of those who are engaged in these promising efforts. Regardless of their place—the university, the schools, or the teacher organization—each partner is dedicated to a more systematic, experience-rich, and reflective environment for the clinical phase of teacher preparation—a phase in which prospective teachers will no longer have to "sink or swim," but rather where they can "learn and earn" the badge of a professional teacher.

—Edward J. Meade
Ford Foundation

INTRODUCTION

With the growing emphasis on empowering teachers, enhancing the role of school administrators, and holding teachers accountable for increased student achievement, the clinical phase of teacher preparation takes on added significance. Today's prospective teachers must be exposed to more complex pedagogies that reflect the diversity of needs in our nation's schools. Consequently, interns must be provided realistic, challenging settings in which they begin to fuse theory and practice under the guidance of experienced mentors. In his book *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* (1990), John Goodlad calls for partnerships between teacher-preparing institutions and schools, which are characterized by ground-breaking collaborative agreements.He suggests that coupled with a rigorous theoretical preparation, comprehensive hands-on field experiences will allow prospective teachers opportunities to develop "a consistent, defensible philosophy of education."

Educators know that the condition of teaching in our urban schools is the most complex and demanding. In an unpublished proposal, Linda Darling-Hammond commented that "in urban, inner city environments...these needs and problems are often exacerbated by school size, community disenfranchisement, culturally diverse classroom populations, and budgetary restrictions...New teachers who enter urban schools often find themselves unprepared to deal with the myriad challenges their classrooms present. Consequently, they are easily defeated by the demands of the classroom and either leave urban school districts or teaching altogether."

These concerns were concretely addressed by the Ford Foundation Clinical Schools Project. Demonstration programs are the necessary first steps toward forging closer relationships between the institutions and schools responsible for preparing successive generations of teachers. We, at AACTE, were pleased to participate with the Ford Foundation in focusing on defining new modes for delivering the clinical practice phase of teacher preparation.

As you read this monograph, we believe you will empathize with the "voices" as they describe the need for and the processes of change, along with their values, their accomplishments, their modifications, and their hopes as they work within a variety of collaborative efforts. They tell us that the demands of changing traditions and professional perspectives require a strong commitment to open dialogue and interaction among all constituents; they tell us that the process is working.

The voices in this report represent student teachers and interns, cooperating teachers and principals, education professors and deans—all of the groups engaged in the collaborative process of a clinical school.

—DAVID G. IMIG
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

A SUPERINTENDENT'S VIEW OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

BY RICHARD W. CLARK

Educators hold onto beliefs that appear to be contrary to the best available knowledge about their field. Consider, for example, the following questions: Why do educators persist in believing that the best way to teach students is to arrange them in ability tracks? Why do educators continue to assume that retaining students at a grade level is good for the students? For that matter, why do they believe that students of the same chronological age should be grouped together for instruction? Why does talking to students continue to be the major teacher activity in a classroom? Why are educators so susceptible to the latest snake-oil salesman to blow into town with a group of flashy overhead transparencies and a series of "neat" teacher activities? Why do teachers continue to work in isolation from each other? Why are solutions to schools' problems emanating from policymakers in state and national governments, instead of from professional educators? Such beliefs and actions suggest a weakness within the education profession.

Weak educators are not born, they are made. They are made by training programs and inertia that emphasize the continuation of teaching approaches which are, at best, uninspiring and, at worst, harmful to children. They are made by preservice field experiences in settings characterized by mindless adoption of teacher-proof packages on instructional techniques, and by workloads that reduce the art of teaching to the task of managing a classroom. They are made by

bureaucratic systems that turn bright, enthusiastic, aspiring teachers into burned out, frustrated veterans. They are made because we give the task of making good teachers (and helping teachers remain effective) too low a priority.

Shared Characteristics of Clinical Settings

We can only strengthen the profession by reversing these conditions. One action required for such a reversal is that of providing settings in which prospective and practicing educators can work and learn together.

Twenty-seven years ago, James B. Conant stressed the critical nature of "practice teaching." During the past ten years, report after report has suggested the need to create what have been variously referred to as Key Schools (Goodlad, 1984), Lead Schools (Carnegie, 1986), and Professional Development Schools (Holmes Group, 1986). Common to each of these conceptualizations (and others which have been offered) has been the notion that the public schools and the institutions of higher education that prepare teachers need to join together to create exemplary educational settings that provide practicum experiences and support continued inquiry into the improvement of schooling.

Meade has suggested that these clinical schools should have five characteristics:

- be a general public school (not one that is a select or specifically focused public school),
- have a student body that reflects the changing demography of American schools,
- integrate teacher development along with the instructional programs for students,
- reflect a diversity of pedagogy and a quest for improving pedagogy, and
- be schools in which it is possible to train a critical mass of interns so that the school cannot ignore its clinical role, and so that the interns can also learn from one another. (Meade, 1990)

In a similar view, the Holmes Group has called for a new long-term partnership between schools and universities for the purpose of creating clinical settings for the training of teachers. They say that "Professional Development Schools...will represent long-term arrangements between universities and school systems, rather than isolated atolls of good practice." (*Tomorrow's Schools*, p. 6)

Proposed Partners Express Reservations

Such partnerships require mutual commitments. These will be hard to achieve, given reservations that both proposed partners have about such roles. Schools have several concerns, the first of which is that public school policymakers often do not see educating educators as their mission. School people, by necessity, place a high priority on satisfying the varied groups that are their constituents. Generally speaking, their constituents want them to educate the children of the community, but the education of adults and the preparation of teachers is viewed as the responsibility of postsecondary institutions.

University-based scholars are concerned about engaging in partnership arrangements with the schools because training carries a stigma as something of lesser value than research. Scholars also worry that the heavy time commitment to school partnerships will remove them from what they perceive to be the mainstream of the university's priorities.

Consider the following remarks by Haberman (1971) regarding the divergence of views of each other's role:

> Public school people regard college people as too theoretical and more concerned with analysis than solutions, not capable of working within legal structures, incapable of hard work during regularly scheduled business hours. College people perceive public school people as too conservative in accepting research or responding to great social problems; fearful of superiors; of lower intelligence, status and education....In truth, both groups are experts in maintaining their own organizations and espousing radical reforms in the other. (p. 134)

Members of the university community also express doubts about engaging in partnerships with schools because they perceive that their institutions will not reward them with promotion or merit compensation for their efforts. Actually, there is little evidence that in the past, rewards have accrued to either school- or university-based professionals for their efforts in providing clinical training for prospective teachers.

URGENCY OF TASK

Despite difficulties prospective partners face, the need is urgent to create effective clinical schools. Throughout the country our best teachers are retiring or moving to jobs that promise professional wages. Schools have desperate needs for educators who can deal with the diverse students who populate today's schools, and who can help these students succeed in a rapidly changing world.

The need to create effective clinical sites is highlighted by shortcomings in existing programs. Laboratory schools, which remain from those that flourished earlier in the century, are too few in number to provide the requisite number of teachers. Moreover, laboratory schools and many of the suburban settings frequently used for student teaching experiences are characterized by student populations that are too homogeneous to make them good practice settings. In too many programs, field experiences are hit or miss with teachers and interns being linked more by chance than by deliberate planning by either school or university officials. Compounding such problems, states and institutions of higher education continue to place low priorities on funding educator preparation programs. Funding deficits lead to salary stipends for supervising teachers that are embarrassingly low, to field experiences that are shorter than desirable, and to generally inadequate supervision and assistance during field experiences. Induction and continuing education, as well as preservice programs, require effective clinical sites. Financial shortfalls also hurt efforts to provide legitimate induction experiences for new teachers and sound continuing education experiences for practicing professionals.

Action Needed

Any who doubt the urgency of the present problems need to review Goodlad's findings in *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* (1990).

Schools and universities must act quickly to satisfy these urgent needs. Both institutions must place a higher priority on preservice and continuing education. Both must approach the task of selecting clinical faculty and prospective teachers with more care. Both will need to recruit and review such candidates as carefully as they search for tenured-line faculty or key school leaders. Such recruiting efforts also must focus on seeking minority candidates. School people must help university staff understand schools, and university faculty will have to help clinical staff comprehend the culture of universities. Leaders from schools and higher education institutions need to convince legislators, regents, and school boards to provide adequate funding for the education of educators, including the provision of salaries for teacher interns and premium salaries for clinical teachers.

School officials must reject prepackaged inservice programs offered by visiting experts and, instead, support faculty and administrators who engage in critical inquiry regarding their professional practices. School districts must refuse to hire graduates of programs that fail to include strong clinical components. Districts need to create clinical schools that are responsive to their constituents, but to do so, district officials will need to work effectively with groups such as unions and parents so these groups understand the vital role played by clinical sites.

Universities must reward faculty who work to strengthen teacher training, and faculty must seek opportunities for legitimate scholarship in their work with clinical sites, rather than complaining about lack of rewards. Universities must stop chasing credit hours within the teacher preparation programs and limit enrollment in their programs. Selected students should be enrolled as cohorts who progress through courses and field experiences in a supportive learning environment.

During the past five years, schools and universities that are part of the National Network for Educational Renewal have begun to address such issues. Elsewhere in the country new partnerships are springing up to address these problems. Such efforts raise the possibility that progress can be made, but the needs are so great, we must act now.

We must develop educators who are strong enough to cope with the challenges facing education; educators who hold different beliefs from those mentioned at the beginning. To do so we must move forward, school and university educators together, to develop clinical settings that enable preservice and continuing professional education to occur with a vigor and quality that exceeds anything we have known.

AN ORIENTATION TO THE CLINICAL SCHOOLS PROJECT

BY MARTHA MEAD

Although eleven sites participated in the first year of planning, only seven sites remained for the implementation phase of the Ford Foundation's clinical schools project. The following describes the project's history, profiles the seven clinical sites where plans were implemented, and provides an overview of the various activities of the partnerships.

PHASE ONE: PLANNING GRANTS

The clinical schools project was initiated in 1988 when the Ford Foundation provided one-year planning grants to eleven university/school district/teacher organization collaboratives. The grants supplied funds to initiate projects to improve the clinical training component of teacher education. In each of the eleven locales, these plans were developed jointly by a public school system or systems, the organizations certified to represent teachers there, and one or more institutions of higher education that offer teacher education programs. In responding to the initial grant proposal, these three-party partnerships were required to address the primary objective of the Foundation; namely, to examine the clinical phase of teacher education and suggest ways to improve that process. Their focus was to shift primary responsibility for the clinical training phase of teacher education from colleges and universities to public schools, in which specifically prepared teachers would be responsible for the school-based phase of the preservice student-teacher/intern experiences.

The eleven sites were selected because of their progress in establishing a framework for collaboration, and for their potential for improving the clinical phase of teacher education in large metropolitan school districts. The settings for the majority of these projects were urban school districts paired with large urban universities. This occurred for several reasons. First, the geographic proximity of a large concentration of schools facilitates the placement of student teachers in schools. Second, the availability of several potentially diverse school districts enables the universities to place students in a variety of teaching situations, thus, broadening their range of experiences. Third, large universities have a greater resource base in terms of personnel and funding from which to draw. This can facilitate the development of new programs and processes.

Phase Two: Implementation

The second phase of the project was to support implementation of the plans in public schools at seven of these sites. In 1989 and again in 1990, proposals by the collaboratives located in the states of Florida, Kentucky, Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington were renewed to implement and continue experimental clinical training programs.

Concurrently, AACTE received funding to serve as a coordinating body for the clinical schools project. AACTE supported the efforts of the seven collaboratives during the planning and implementation phases by performing the following functions: (1) establishing a national advisory committee of educators recognized for their professional work in clinical training (During the same grant year, the advisory committee met twice to discuss the project's goals, directions, and implications for teacher preparation throughout the country.), (2) planning and conducting two workshops for representatives from the projects, and (3) publishing four issues of a newsletter devoted to clinical training activities within the framework of the project. AACTE also supported multicultural education efforts proposed by the seven projects, and established a clearinghouse on clinical training.

Although the organizational structures of the seven collaboratives that made up the clinical schools project differ, and their geographical locations span the country, they do share the common belief: that there is a continuum of professional development within teacher education. They are all committed to enhancing each phase of this continuum by promoting dialogue, reflection, and inquiry among participants of the projects.

To create effective clinical sites for conducting student teaching experiences, these collaboratives have all engaged in activities that have initiated or strengthened the characteristics of clinical schools advocated by Meade and that incorporate numerous of the action-needed proposals suggested by Clark earlier in this monograph. Several of these characteristics, including the use of (1) selection criteria, (2) training components for interns and cooperating teachers, and (3) documentation/evaluation procedures, are described from a project-specific perspective in the next section of this chapter.

Profiles of Seven Clinical Sites

To set the stage for the major focus of this monograph—the "voices" of participants from the collaboratives—brief descriptive statements provided by the project directors are presented here. These statements highlight the general focus of each project's involvement in the clinical practice component of preservice teacher education. Additional data about the projects, including the names of the participating agencies and schools, numbers of interns served, and length of field experiences, are included in the reference section of this publication.

Site 1: Dade County, Florida. This project was designed to implement a variation of Cogan's clinical supervision model during the practice teaching phase of the preservice teacher education program. Five schools—three elementary, one middle, and one senior high—representing the multicultural diversity of the community, were identified as clinical training centers. Time provisions were made to permit classroom teachers to assume the major responsibility for carrying out supervisory duties related to working with interns, who were assigned to a year-long

training period within the schools. An extensive training period was required of cooperating teachers. Activities that were explicitly designed to develop rapport between the intern and supervising teacher were provided. Classroom observation techniques were emphasized and data were collected on a regular basis regarding the interns' effectiveness on critical dimensions of the teaching process. Formal conferences that preceded and followed classroom observation sessions were held daily.

Site 2: Louisville, Kentucky. A variety of site-based activities were extended to the 120 student teachers/interns placed in the eight participating schools that made up this clinical site. Each of these schools developed a formal orientation for trainees, and an informal school support system. Training experiences and facilities provided to the interns varied from school to school. Some of these activities included the following: A teaching/learning lab was placed at Pleasure Ridge Park High School for trainees to experiment with different learning strategies and receive feedback from students in a controlled setting. At Fairdale High School, those trainees engaged in early field work were paired with student teachers. A similar arrangement occurred at Conway Middle Schools; trainees were assigned in pairs to interdisciplinary teaching teams. The elementary schools all provided opportunities for trainees to work in multi- and single-grade placements. A coordinator of trainee activities was appointed from the teaching staffs of the participating elementary schools.

Site 3: Gorham, Maine. This secondary teacher education program began with a weekend of experiential education using Outward Bound-type activities. Following a three-day university orientation, interns were assigned to one clinical training site for the first two weeks of school. They return to campus for eleven weeks of intensive study in five academic classes. During this period, the interns continued a weekly observation day at one of the clinical sites. From this experience, interns selected the site for the internship assignment, which occurred during the spring term.

The site coordinator held adjunct professor status at the university, and received a small stipend and an additional duty-free period at school. The coordinator organized all school activities, monitored intern/teacher progress, observed interns in teaching situations, and participated on project advisory committees. Interns could work in collegial situations with one or more teachers within or across departments. Each cooperating teacher observed each of the interns in the school as part of further professional growth and, in the following year, visited one intern as a beginning teacher.

Site 4: New York City. The basic program extended the master's degree program at Teachers College from one year to two. In the second year, selected student teachers assumed positions of teacher-interns, team-teaching with two teachers already functioning as a team. The intern taught four days a week at four-fifths salary. The fifth day was spent on academic work needed to complete the master's degree requirements.

An additional innovation involved an intense interdisciplinary student-teaching experience at one of the clinical schools. For three weeks during the college intersession, interns spent every day at a school working in interdisciplinary teams of four with complementary teams of cooperating teachers. Special interdisciplinary programs, carefully planned, cut across the usual schedules and class hours at the school.

Site 5: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The Pittsburgh school district/University collaborative program promoted teaching as a decision-making process. The goal was to prepare student teachers (undergraduate) and interns (graduate level) to function as effective classroom teachers in a multicultural urban setting. During the 1990-91 school year, the program operated at four urban high schools; three of these sites provided clinical experiences for student teachers as well as interns. A new governance structure was comprised of an operations committee and an executive committee, and a general assembly fed information and concerns to both groups.

Groups made up of both basic and higher education personnel in specific subject areas met to determine what content-specific pedagogy interns and student teachers should be able to demonstrate by the end of their clinical experience.

Site 6: Rochester, New York. The defining characteristic of the Professional Practice Schools Collaborative was the commitment of participants to induct student teachers into a "community of learners." Such a community would promote dialogue, reflection, and inquiry among all participants, with the goal of improving student learning.

The following items indicate the progress of the Rochester initiative. The teaming of special education and regular education teachers took place in one of the schools. Student teachers participated in the Discovery Magnet program, and they visited social service agencies in the community. Teacher Researcher/Teacher Coordinator positions were established, and these people met regularly with teams of cooperating teachers and student teachers at each site to discuss teaching/learning issues.

Site 7: Seattle, Washington. A collaboratively planned and implemented postbaccalaureate program for middle school teachers was established through the Puget Sound Professional Development Center. The program provided student teachers with a knowledge base directly linked to the needs of middle school teachers (e.g., interdisciplinary curriculum, team teaching, early adolescent development). The student teachers combined course work with extensive field experiences at one of the participating schools. They were encouraged to participate in colloquia, study groups, and other special professional growth activities at the site schools.

These brief project profiles illustrate that the seven projects have distinctive organizational plans, goals, objectives, and procedures. They are loosely linked together by sharing a common purpose of fulfilling the objectives of the Ford Foundation grant. And, of course, they have shared experiences by participating in the coordinating activities provided by AACTE. For the most part, however, the

"voices" that make up the following segment of this monograph reflect the professional experiences that the individual respondents encountered during their involvement with their specific collaborative site.

Overview of Planning and Implementation

To promote linkage among the seven collaboratives during the implementation phase, the site project directors submitted to the AACTE project director copies of source documents to substantiate planning and implementation activities. These documents included collaborative agreements between participating agencies, instructional training materials, classroom teaching evaluation instruments, and school handbooks. An analysis of the documents showed that all of the projects engaged in certain similar activities and procedures, as follows.

Development and Use of Selection Criteria. All of the projects used criteria in selecting school sites, clinical trainers, and interns. The degree of specificity varied for each of these components among the projects. Sometimes a major criterion was simply willingness to participate, whether it be a school, trainer, or intern.

In the case of school sites, serving a culturally diverse population reflective of the composition of the community was a selection factor. Schools staffed with faculty and administrators who had a history of working cooperatively with university faculty were also selected. Schools that had previously been identified as professional development schools or that already had an existing student teaching program were also selected to participate in this clinical schools project. Some schools were recommended as appropriate sites for the preservice clinical training program; others, as sites for beginning teacher interns.

A major task confronting the planning committees of each of the projects was that of defining the role of the clinical teacher (trainer), and of determining selection criteria. Again criteria were not exclusively operationally defined by way of specific competencies. Commitment and willingness to participate in professional development activities were important factors in the selection process. Some of the criteria used among the projects included: a master's degree, three to five years of successful teaching, and letters of recommendation from a principal and supervisors. The focus on commitment is illustrated by the Rochester, New York, project's Teacher Institute Program: Prospective cooperating teacher candidates agreed to participate in the program for two years.

The teaching candidates affiliated with the clinical schools project came to the various teaching programs with different qualifications and goals. Some had bachelor's degrees; some were pursuing an MAT degree; others were engaged exclusively in a middle-school teacher preparation pilot program. Once again, the selection criteria varied among the projects, although meeting specific academic criteria prior to admittance was a common requirement.

During the second grant year, the Pittsburgh project evaluated and refined its intern selection process. The process had three parts: *Screening* related to academic eligibility; *credentials* included a writing sample that demonstrated ability to conceptualize various aspects of teaching and reported experience and interest related to

teaching in urban settings; and *interview* contained responses to a series of question groups with a composite rating scale for overall impression of the candidate ranging from low to high.

Training Component for Clinical Trainers. Each of the projects provided workshops, seminars, and training sessions for school personnel working with student teachers and interns. Again, the projects approached this training activity in a variety of ways. The Dade County, Florida, project conducted the most extensive summer workshop for clinical supervisors. Training lasted for 16 days and included the use of TADS, the teacher assessment and development system required by the Dade County public school system.

Although not all of the projects reported conducting formal summer workshop sessions, all projects provided some training and orientation for school personnel. Presentations were frequently team taught by university and school-based faculty, as well as by outside consultants. Topics and materials related to reflective teaching, leadership styles, adult learning, and clinical supervision were included in these training modules.

All projects conducted seminars and other professional development activities throughout the grant period. Modes of delivery, frequency of occurrence, content focus, and compensation features varied among the projects and, in some cases, from school site to school site within a project. At one site, for example, all cooperating teachers enrolled in a three-credit graduate-level supervision course conducted on site at the New York City project. The course was jointly taught by a Teachers College faculty member, a classroom teacher, and a school administrator.

Training Component of Preservice Trainees. Once again, there was no standard procedure or guidelines followed by the projects in providing instruction to student teachers during their on-site field experience. A brief description of a few training practices conducted at some of the sites are noted here.

At the Puget Sound Professional Development Center project in Seattle, Washington, a "theory with practice" seminar was closely coordinated with the field experience program. The seminar was taught by an interdisciplinary team of university faculty and master teachers from the four participating middle school sites.

Weekly seminars taught by school site personnel and other school district personnel were offered for academic credit to the interns at the Pittsburgh project.

The Rochester, New York, project provided weekly seminars for student teachers at one school site. These sessions were conducted by the cooperating teachers, who receive monetary compensation from one of the participating universities for their involvement in the program.

Action research workshops were open to interns and cooperating teachers participating in the Maine clinical schools project. Teacher trainees in the Louisville, Kentucky, project had access to peer coaches to assist them in improving their classroom instruction.

Evaluation and Documentation Activities. The seven collaboratives engaged in a variety of assessment and documentation activities to determine how well they accomplished project goals during the first year of implementation. Common areas of assessment related to intern teaching performance recorded on evaluation instruments. Follow-up interviews and intern/cooperating teacher perceptions of program effectiveness were recorded on survey instruments. The projects also accumulated data of a self-reflective nature by requiring key players to keep journals related to their experiences.

The next segment of this monograph may be seen as a formative evaluation piece on the impact of the project on the participants directly involved in these clinical school projects—teachers, student teachers and interns, school administrators, college/university faculty, and administrators.

THE PARTICIPANTS' VOICES:

OBSERVATIONS, EXPERIENCES, AND RESULTS FROM THE CLINICAL SCHOOLS PROJECT

The "voices" of the stakeholder participants in the clinical schools projects were collected at each site by a project coordinator. The AACTE project director proposed several questions or concerns to each coordinator and requested that "voices" be solicited from participants holding different roles within the project. As in all other aspects of the project, central direction was kept to a minimum, with the expectation that what was reported would represent the priorities, processes, and accomplishments of each site.

The responses spanned most of the questions and concerns proposed. Some responses were transcribed interviews of individuals or groups; some were individually written by a specific role player; some were ideas and responses collected by the site coordinator and compiled into an organized "theme" paper. All responses were developed in a free-lance style and cast from the personal perspective of a respondent.

Each site is not represented in the response to each question, and no attempt was made to select voices based on any quality criteria; even so, the voices are effective in delivering their message. It is important to understand that the voices were captured at the end of a second year of Ford Foundation funding, which may have been a second year for some sites or a third or fourth year for others that were already engaged in unfunded renewal projects. The voices reported here do not represent a formal project report in any accountability way. This monograph is not a research-based paper, but a sampling of

the experiences of professionals who are working at new modes for handling the clinical-experience phase of preservice teacher preparation degree programs. It is hoped their experiences and perspectives will contribute to similar renewal efforts underway across the nation.

The voices presented below responded to eight questions that tease out some observations and results of the new experiences professional educators and preservice teachers were having in structured clinical school settings. We believe these voices present a compelling and enjoyable message for renewal of the teacher preparation process—some confirming our concerns and our practices, and others opening new vistas of opportunity for improved results.

Nature and Results of Feedback to Interns

Question 1. In the clinical schools project, what is the nature of the feedback to the interns during the student teaching experience, and what actions result from the feedback?

If a desirable change in the preparation and induction of new teachers is to have them be better prepared to assume full responsibility for teaching on the first day of school, it would seem that persons preparing to be teachers would enjoy a thorough, realistic interchange with their trainers. Inasmuch as the various sites in this clinical schools project are developing different modes for the preservice teaching experience, the nature of this feedback and resulting action could represent an important contribution to the defined problem.

The voices demonstrate the different levels of activities and different approaches being used to identify effective methods for critiquing the experiences of preservice teachers during their intern or student teaching period.

"The Voices"

Both programmatic and personal linkage with the clinical schools has been new for me; since I am assigned to only two schools I can become intimate with the site, the community, the administrators, and the teachers who work with the interns. We are more collegial, yet more professional. It has become easier to raise issues and ask questions. The style of supervision of interns has changed, with the cooperating teachers and site coordinators giving more of the direct supervision; I am much more involved in dialogue with the cooperating teachers. I also became a mentor and friend to the intern/teacher team.

—*Kulawiec, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine*

This project has forced us in this district to identify with some specificity what competencies are required for the effective supervision of interns. It was necessary to identify what supervisory knowledge, strategies, and skills were needed as well as to formulate a working definition of what constitutes effective teaching. We now have supervisor training in such strategies as selective verbatim, at-task techniques, movement patterns, and wide lens techniques. We now know that we must work with the interns on assessing pupil growth and progress, using cooperative learning techniques, incorporating elements of reflective teaching, and creating a productive learning culture, and we must guide the interns in using professional journals. An organized plan for networking among the interns and supervising teachers is essential.

—Walker, site coordinator, and Senita, project assistant, Dade County, Florida

One important type of feedback is the mandatory daily conference log completed by the intern and the cooperating teacher. This log provides focus by listing items of importance to the teaching process, providing illustrations of good decisions, and defining things that need further work. The Teacher Assessment and Development System (TADS) provides a great deal of insight into the interns' teaching methods, strengths, and weaknesses and prepares them for instructional observations conducted during the first year of teaching.

—Ray, intern, Dade County, Florida

Daily feedback by the directing teacher was the most valuable experience for me. She was constantly observing me and I her, and I was able to model many of her behaviors that I wanted to internalize. We developed a professional growth plan with specific goals, and identified professional qualities and competencies I wanted to achieve. The goals were broken down into steps for me to accomplish and excel in. It was always "our plan" and "our goals." The daily conferences gave me the opportunity to relate directly to each situation discussed, to document time on task, and to visualize the multiple dimensions of planning. Role playing "what if" was a helpful technique for extending my thinking about my classroom behavior.

—Hofer, intern, Dade County, Florida

Both the interns and the clinical instructors receive training in a research-based teaching model that provides for a common language, as well as a theoretical base for discussing the effectiveness of instruction. On the basis of this common beginning, the learning process becomes a feedback model. Our model, Technical Feedback, virtually forces reflectiveness upon novices by guiding them to examine, in a given piece of teaching, what went right and what went wrong. Relying upon the data collected from anecdotal

notes taken for a period of ten to fifteen minutes, the clinical instructor assists the intern in an analysis of one or two teaching decisions that were effective as well as one or two that were less effective. Given the time and attention constraints that clinical instructors and interns work under, this particular model seems to effectively engage the novice teacher in a dialogue that promotes self-awareness as a decision maker in the classroom.

—*Granigan, site coordinator, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

The Ford Intern Teaching Inventory was a helpful feedback instrument. The inventory listed a series of teacher behaviors that were expected as part of the teaching process. The observer checks those behaviors observed, and that checklist provides a basis for the critique following the observation. Thus, both strengths and weaknesses are identified, and one can work at developing these behaviors across time.

—*Ray and Hofer, interns, Dade County, Florida*

A typical week involves a one-hour group meeting with all interns. These meetings are designed for "touching base"; we share experiences, information, and schedules. Occasionally we have speakers, including our most popular one, Charlie. He is a first-year teacher who has completed his internship. He provides the light at the end of the tunnel; he understands the frustrations of the interns and can offer many suggestions based on his experience. Both the preservice teachers and I find these meetings a most rewarding part of the program.

—*Gosney, site coordinator, Seattle, Washington*

MULTIPLE ASPECTS OF DIVERSITY

Question 2. In what ways has the clinical schools project facilitated the improvement of understanding and of work behaviors relative to the diversity of students, diversity of curriculum content, diversity of instructional style and pedagogy, and diversity of the community?

Equality of learning opportunity continues to be a major shortcoming of the way we teach children and operate schools. The results of national testing programs continue to show unequal learning outcomes among all ages of students when analyzed by gender, race, economic background, and social status. Not all handicapped students are being served well, nor are all exceptionally able students being served well. The population of our schools is a constantly changing mix of minorities and majorities depending upon who is deciding and for what reasons. Specific instructional strategies for teaching individuals within this tremendously diverse population must be a part of teacher preparation programs.

At the university I am exposed to the most revolutionary, theoretical applications and methodologies for teaching a proficiency-oriented, content-based curriculum. At the school with my clinical instructor I am encouraged to experiment with these ideas in the classroom, adapting or modifying them to meet the needs of the curriculum and of the individual students.

A major concern of the collaborative project addresses education in a multicultural, urban setting. In workshops interns are exposed to and provided with vital information regarding individual differences among students. Specialists within the school district share their expertise in dealing with different learning styles and different learning environments. Workshop topics also include discussions on students at risk, exceptional students, ethnic issues and concerns, and effective teaching in an urban setting.

—Freehling, intern, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

We convinced a university professor to hold her university class in our school building; to have the university students (preservice teachers) go to their course in our school, have our teachers come to her class in school, have the university students go into our classrooms with our students and deal with them firsthand, and to generally interact across all groups in terms of the learning outcomes for the course. The college students (interns) prepared questions for our middle school students as a vehicle for learning more about them and how to approach teaching them. One of the questions asked, "Do you think your parents care about you?" Surprisingly, more than half of the middle school children said, "No." The opportunity to see that middle school children are in a period of transition, that they aren't as self-assured as they try to be, was really beneficial. Our teachers also got some strokes because they were sharing their expertise with future teachers and with university faculty.

—Rudolph, Noe, and Peercy, clinical teachers, and Harbison, principal, Lassiter Middle School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

The student teachers who come to us are knowledgeable about team-streaming students of different ability levels, and they are enthusiastic about working with students of different ability levels, trying to test the water, so to speak, and see if they can handle teaching a wide range of abilities. When I am working with the student teachers, I like to make sure that I have covered the different strands of strategies; that I am not locked into one particular teaching mode, but that I have demonstrated the use of a variety of teaching modes and strategies each designed to achieve various outcomes among the various students. I demonstrate how to use ability grouping to foster some

kinds of learning and how to use jigsaw groups to foster other kinds of learning. The student teachers learn how important good planning is. Having a good plan and a good understanding of the student's ability levels provides for the effective use of different strategies in order to enhance learning for each student. Most of these strategies apply cooperative learning principles and are designed to actively involve the students in learning.

One of the best experiences my student teacher had this year involved the school's evolving a "no-fail policy." Planning an approach to this policy lead to questions such as, How do you work with students who are failing? How do you get them to make up work? How do you get them to produce work when they sit there and refuse to work? The student teacher used a variety of approaches to answer these questions and had a good experience in working with these at-risk students.

—Powell and Streibel, clinical teachers, Fairdale High School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

It is difficult to expand reflective teaching to include an analysis of the historical and social context of teaching. It is difficult for educators to connect debates and assumptions about schooling to their own practices. The histories of testing, tracking, grading, and curriculum content of the schools can be useful to understanding the origins and perpetuation of existing practices. Such an understanding can help educators reflect on and question their own assumptions about schooling and the needs of today's diverse society.

—Hursh, project evaluator, Rochester, New York

Networking with other interns and teachers improved my repertoire of effective teaching behaviors. I was able to internalize behaviors that I desired for interactions with students. I was able to see a new, different curriculum involving revolutionary ideas for special education. I realized the curriculum for the learning disabled must evolve from dittos to more creative, brain-engaging learning activities that boost the self-esteem of teachers and students.

—Hofer, intern, Dade County, Florida

The extended year-long internship in and of itself is a tremendous opportunity for a developing teacher. Immersion in a diverse, multicultural teaching environment helps make the intern more aware of how to adapt to different students, and learn flexibility in order to enhance the learning for each of the children. Working with a variety of students of different learning abilities from different backgrounds and cultures provided opportunity to apply many learning principles presented at the university. My school had a

diverse student population, and I was able to learn how the teachers coped with all the many differences and learning styles.

—*Ray, intern, Dade County, Florida*

We admit a unique group of midcareer and postbaccalaureate students by bringing our colleagues from the clinical schools into the selection process. We have found our interns to be more open to change, to have less need for order, to be more prone to analyze their motives and feelings, to understand how others feel about problems, and to judge people by why they do things rather than what they do. We hope that we are working with the schools to establish a professional climate that values these attributes.

—*Broyles, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine*

To address the diversity of learning needs, students whether in regular, special, or LEP programs, are working together with greater frequency as their classroom teachers plan and schedule opportunities for commingling to occur. Common planning periods are being effectively used to formulate and deliver a more highly congruent instructional program.

—*Rohan, principal, Rochester, New York*

Those of us planning to work in Pittsburgh were preparing to teach in the urban environment. We were asked to identify what equal opportunity in the classroom means as a teacher's responsibility and set of behaviors. What is the teacher's role in selecting instructional materials that are suitable for teaching in a multiethnic environment? We debated various techniques and strategies that would effectively address the multiple needs of a wide variety of students. We had to envision what a real urban classroom was like until we observed in some summer school classrooms in the city. Even with this deliberate effort on specific preparation for urban teaching in a multicultural environment, we were not fully prepared for the first real teaching experience in that setting.

—*Flynn, intern, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

Impact on Professional Roles

Question 3. Describe the impact the clinical schools project has had on all the professional roles within the school; for example, mentoring relationships, the practice of reflective teaching and evaluation, and the enhancement of teaching, as a result of improved interactions.

The collaborative nature of the clinical schools project was designed to facilitate and enhance the roles of the variety of persons who interact in the preparation and induction of teachers. Some evidence indicates that while various segments of the profession are working toward the common goal of preparing quality teachers, they are not necessarily pursuing that goal in cooperative or collaborative ways. The responses here provide a sampling of

observations about role changes that have resulted from this collection of collaborative clinical school projects.

"The Voices"

While reflective teaching and teacher-as-researcher have been project goals, they have been implemented in a variety of ways. Some teachers have used teacher-as-researcher projects to improve their teaching by carefully observing their students' learning, gaining more control over decisions affecting their classrooms and the school, and connecting educational readings to their practice. Teachers in one elementary school have begun observing each other's teaching and as a result, have combined some regular and special education classes. Some teachers have taken a leadership role and are assisting other teachers in initiating research projects in their classrooms, and other teachers have promoted the reorganization of the school to give teachers time and space to accomplish defined improvement objectives. Within the Rochester City School District, teachers are now consulting with teachers in other schools about becoming teacher-researchers.

—Hursh, project evaluator, Rochester, New York

Teaching in isolation has been dramatically reduced. Regular teachers, special education teachers and student teachers meet regularly to thoughtfully reflect and plan together. More than ever before we are teaching children rather than programs. Teachers are looking for improved ways to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of the children. Cooperative learning and teaching through use of themes can be observed much more readily as professionals have opportunities to observe new teaching strategies. There appears to be a greater sense of community and working together to make our new ways of doing business successful.

—Rohan, principal, Rochester, New York

One of the major modifications of the role of the directing teacher in response to the clinical supervisory program is the provision of daily released time. This time is critical to meet the requirement of implementing a daily clinical supervisory cycle, including a preobservation conference, an observation, and a postobservation conference. The released time became possible when we restructured the school day and allocated a budget for such activity.

This district also has a newly emerging definition of professionalization of teaching as a result of the collaborative clinical teacher project. Professionalization is no longer seen as simply having an expanded awareness of the importance of engaging in dialogue with other competent professionals.

It is seen as a chance to mold a neophyte to excellence and touch the lives of countless future children. It is an opportunity to expand the ranks of teachers who can make a difference.

—*Walker, site coordinator, and Senita, project assistant, Dade County, Florida*

I have found that learning about teaching is strictly an academic activity until you start to actually teach. As interns, we went to the university for an educational theory course during the summer. Just before school opened in the fall, we attended well-conceived seminars presented by personnel from the Pittsburgh Public Schools. On the first day of class, we began working with our cooperating teachers and the students in our assigned classes. Doing the actual teaching was the real learning-to-teach activity. Learning about how to teach in the various disciplines in our classes at the university became a more meaningful activity now. We were able to balance the theory-based instruction with the reality of the classroom in which we worked. Teaching and observing within a well-defined support system and a well-conceived plan for collaboration between university and school district has made the experience of being a new teacher a good one.

Working everyday with a clinical instructor has made the experience less traumatic for us, and enabled us to get daily feedback from an enlightened, experienced source. Our site coordinator, a teacher trained to work with interns, monitors our progress on a weekly basis and also offers feedback after observing us teach. We get additional feedback from the university supervisor who observes and critiques our teaching, and who also consults with the clinical instructors.

—*Flynn, intern, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

To see student teachers' grow and develop is gratifying. The whole school community feels enthusiastic about the incredibly important job we are doing. Administrators, experienced teachers, and student teachers are enriched through colloquia, fireside chats, committee meetings, and the use of the newly added professional library, and their involvement is exciting to watch. At a site meeting it is common to see and hear all three groups discussing a concept together, and the next day to hear the same subject discussed with other colleagues at lunch. Reallocated time and compensation for meetings after school have empowered the supervisors and the cooperating teachers and strengthened their commitment to our student teachers. Around our building the aura of growth, the strength of empowerment, and the feeling of accomplishment for a job well done are almost touchable.

—*Gosney, site coordinator, Seattle, Washington*

IMPACT OF COMMUNICATION

Question 4. What impact has the clinical schools project made on intercommunication processes among the schools within the clusters, other schools within the system, the higher education institutions, and the teacher associations?

The 1980s' movement to improve teacher preparation programs focused attention on theory versus practice of teaching, and related this to the "ivy halls" image of the higher education institutions' theoretical contribution to teacher education. This theoretical contribution was in opposition to the practical needs of the teacher in the classroom and the experiential knowledge base of the craft of teaching as developed by practitioners at the forefront of teaching. Cooperative professional development centers are now commonplace, as are a variety of other partnership and collaborative enterprises throughout the nation. Yet, there still remains a need for process and product models to assure that all future teachers are adequately prepared in both the theory and the practice of teaching effectively. How do we communicate within the education community about teaching effectiveness? The following responses contribute to the literature about process and product models of collaborative clinical teacher preparation programs.

"THE VOICES"

The first hard lesson I had to deal with as a member of the collaborative clinical teacher preparation program was the change in my attitude toward the union's role in education. I had been a school-level union representative in several of my previous teaching assignments and found the unions to be driven by embittered, complaining secondary school teachers. After agreeing to participate in this project, I figured we had to have the union involved, but it would be a pain to do so. Through my experiences in this project, I have to admit I was wrong. The union representatives on this committee are outstanding educators with as deep and abiding interest in children as anyone. They both listened and heard the voices of all teachers. I also began to understand how listening to all teachers placed reform-minded union personnel between a rock and a hard place. Since educational change will never take place if mandated by a minority, the union is the only player in the educational change game in a position to work both with teachers less than eager to change and powerful policymakers anxious to mandate change. The union representatives I am working with in this project are not throwing up roadblocks to change. They are, instead, attempting to help steer a course through the roadblocks that the existing culture of both schools and society has constructed, which constrain educational change.

—Snyder, evaluator, New York City

The collaborative program fosters communicative interaction among interns, experienced teachers, clinical instructors, site liaisons, and university supervisors. Unlike other teacher education certification programs where students work only with a mentor teacher for nine weeks, these interns benefit from a pool of knowledge and experience as they dialogue with numerous individuals during the full school year. The breadth of exposure in this learning experience is much more productive than the alternate narrow model where interns are assigned to one supervising teacher who has not been exposed to the collaborative experience.

—Freehling, intern, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

We started with two high schools and thirteen interns. We have doubled the number of interns and each year during the project added one additional school, clearly setting as criteria for selection that each school be involved in a restructuring program. The program is not tied by a traditional school or university calendar; interns move back and forth regularly between the university and the schools. Our clinical teachers asked that interns come into the school at the beginning of the year, so we now have the interns on a full-year residency program.

My most significant learning lab has been the clinical training schools. Each year, representatives from the schools work with university faculty and me to evaluate and make programmatic changes. Through this project, the school teachers are also developing a broader focus on the total picture of teacher preparation. Teachers from three of the schools have taken teaching responsibility for each of the content specialty portions of my curriculum design campus-based course, and our adolescent development course is cotaught by a guidance counselor.

To give our interns an experience broader than their classroom assignment, we have initiated a school-based inquiry project that requires interns to study a schoolwide need, concern, or interest. At each school, members of the Advisory Committee work with the interns in this inquiry process.

When we train our cooperating teachers for the supervisor function, we model the workshop after the peer support plan required for recertification; two outstanding cooperating teachers head up this activity. In addition, each participating school identifies a particular school improvement theme for which we organize seminars, training sessions, outside speakers or consultants, and other technical support where appropriate. Some of the themes developed have been implementing an interdisciplinary curriculum, learning student development processes and alternative assessment techniques, and coteaching with special educators.

—Broyles, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine

Participation in the clinical schools project has encouraged some teachers from our elementary school to work with teachers at the middle school to provide continuity for the students' transition to the middle school. Our teachers have also worked in staff development roles with teachers in two other elementary schools in the district. Presently we plan to develop a professional relationship with interested teachers at the high school as it becomes part of the collaborative project. It is also interesting to note how Nazareth College's project liaison person has become so well integrated into our community of learners that she is truly missed during the times when she and the interns are not on site. The project has been immensely facilitated by the project coordinator representing the district management, and she is able to serve effectively as an advocate for our needs and wants.

—Rohan, principal, Rochester, New York

In reference to university involvement, as a cooperating teacher, I have seen an increase in the time spent here by the university supervisor—helping define the work of the student teacher, looking specifically at lesson plans, and sharing in the observations and critiques. This enhances the feedback and opportunity for growth for the student. Having the student teacher in the classroom with me is also proving beneficial in that there is someone with whom to share classroom experiences, to share in assessing lessons and situations, and to give feedback to one another. This interaction encourages reflective teaching on my part and on the student teacher's part.

—Rudolph, Noe, and Peercy, clinical teachers, Lassiter Middle School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

Within the clinical schools project, the university now sees our role differently. They asked us up front what we expect of the student teachers and what we expect of the university. They (university faculty) used to tell the student teachers, "Here's what you are to do; go out and do it." But, they never told us what that was. Now we have had input into what the student teachers should do and everything is stated in black and white. Everybody has the same list of requirements, and we can actually go through and check each item off as the experiences develop. We know what our responsibilities are, what the university has already taught students, and we can plan how to reinforce it. Once we know what the university goals are, we can formulate the objectives for the student teachers to obtain those goals.

The student teachers know they are coming into a clinical training site and their attitude is good; they're expecting a positive situation and therefore work more deliberately to make it a good learning experience. Being a clinical training site has caused all of us to look inside ourselves, to stop and evaluate

ourselves, and to mentally prepare ourselves for the whole teaching/learning experience to be a better one.

I sense that good things happen on our staff because everyone takes their leadership roles seriously. They don't just keep information and knowledge to themselves, but share it with the student teachers and with the other teachers. The student teachers are working in and out of several classrooms getting a broader experience and spreading their competencies as well. I see us growing in our leadership roles. It's good for us; it's good for the kids. We've certainly bonded with the student teachers.

—Kyser, Evans, Brown, and Gritton, clinical teachers, and Bush, principal, Wheeler Elementary School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

At its inception the critical issue for the schools and the union was that the partnership with Teachers College be one of equals, in no way to be seen as a "school improvement project" in which the college was to be perceived as working *on*, as opposed to working *with*, the participating schools. For its part the college was equally concerned that the schools not be viewed as rescuing their teacher education programs.

One of the most compelling lessons within the project has been the complexity of the school/university relationships. I'm speaking not of the personal interactions, crucial as they are, but of the institutional interstices between the culture of the schools and that of the university. No single formula, certainly not that which characterizes one as "practice" and the other as "theory" can do justice to this complexity. It's not that there exists such a vast difference between the two institutions as there would be, say, between a school and a store, or a university and a government office. It is precisely the similarity of the two that fosters the illusion that meshing the gears should be a relatively simple operation.

The task of promoting trust among the schools and more involvement on the part of the college was facilitated by our twenty-person planning committee. During the course of two years, a mutual respect for the energy, intelligence, and integrity of the participating teachers and the teacher education faculty developed. Very soon the committee became "us" and the larger institutions became "them." There is more to running schools, managing the activities of the United Federation of Teachers, and organizing the operation of Teachers College than just the preparation of teachers. What our project has striven to establish with these institutions is the need to accord teacher education a higher priority than it now occupies—it must be seen as a collaborative enterprise.

—Quinn, project director, New York City

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE KNOWLEDGE BASE OF TEACHING

Question 5. What kind of contribution has the clinical schools project made on the development of the knowledge base of teaching for interns, as well as for experienced teachers and administrators?

Griffin (1986) states that reference to

> an ideal teacher suggests someone who is skillful and knowledgeable about the work of teaching, is continuing to learn about that work, is thinking about his or her activities such that decisions are made based more on evidence than on whimsy, is accumulating information for the purpose of using it as a means to advance the science and art of teaching, and is working with others toward identifying and solving the dilemmas that have and will forever characterize large-scale efforts to educate a citizenry. (pp. 146-147)

An underlying assumption of this question is that all teachers must be involved in reflective analysis and processes of inquiry to be able to make contributions to the knowledge base on the art and science of teaching. The voices respond to the lifetime learning aspect of teaching and teacher education and address aspects of Griffin's ideal teacher.

"THE VOICES"

My dual role as a classroom teacher and university teaching associate for the middle-level seminar is, of course, impacted by negative issues, but the overwhelming impact is positive and renewing. A friend recently noticed that I was reading a copy of *Learning to Teach* by Richard Arends (1990) and commented that I was too close to retirement to learn how to do it correctly now. At the time I laughed, but in reflection I know that it is never too late to learn to teach; that is the basis for the excitement, strength, and motivation of the Professional Development Center renewal program. We at the middle level can learn better methods and strategies whether we are student teachers or veterans—and we are learning.

—Brantigan, clinical teacher and university teaching associate, Seattle, Washington

The periodic meetings at the university help in other ways. Meeting with the teaching teams and other site supervisors helps to increase cross-site collegiality and sharing of valuable information and insights. Problems and situations that the student teachers bring to our meetings can be shared within these groups. More often than not, we find common problems and develop common solutions. Being a site supervisor helps me grow every day. It has revitalized and energized my approach to teaching. It always leaves me with unanswered questions that stretch my mind.

—Gosney, site coordinator, Seattle, Washington

To the question of what impact the clinical schools project has made on my role as principal, I must say "too little has changed." Yes, I helped in the original program design, enabled others to plan and deliver sharing opportunities, actively helped select teachers to participate each semester, and serve as a resource when concerns arise. I'm weighing, however, how I may grow personally and professionally and how I may contribute to the growth of others through the clinical schools project. Of most concern is that my active and direct involvement with the graduate student teachers is about at the same level as it was under the previous model, which may be entirely my fault.

—*Rohan, principal, Rochester, New York*

As a university instructor and supervisor, my own development has been greatly influenced by the clinical teacher education model. I have seen an expansion of my professional knowledge about recent developments in teacher education and in schooling, especially concerning rural education. I think this comes about because of three components: the nature of the students, the linkage with the clinical schools, and the organization of the program. The program structure and organization have been intricately thought out and planned with a central director in charge, not dispersed as in my other university supervisory positions. During the fall semester, I meet with the advisory committee and the cooperating teachers of my assigned schools in preparation for the spring internships. During the spring internships, I participate in teacher seminars in which all teachers join to talk about common problems. I also attend wrap-up sessions with cooperating teachers and other personnel in the schools. This model gets everyone into learning.

—*Kulawiec, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine*

We felt that it was important that the curriculum of the teacher education program be a model, not just a model of good teacher education, but a model of the newest approaches in curriculum restructuring. As an illustration of the results of that curriculum, teachers in our clinical schools are conducting action research on interdisciplinary curriculum, are teaching the subject area teachers to work with a cohort of students, and are using writing across the curriculum. Our own university classes show similar improvements. Each instructor in our program is delighted by our cohort of interns who share the similarities from their disciplines and prepare interdisciplinary teaching units that stress experiential learning. Problem solving, reflective thinking, and cooperative learning are course vehicles that show that knowledge is process as well as content. The interns use the "foxfire" approach to write stories for adolescents. They select themes for microteaching to maintain continuity. They write learning contracts and meet in conference

with the professor as they learn about working with the exceptional student in the regular classroom.

—Broyles, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine

We're always conscious that we're not alone. I've noticed that the trainees take it all in—every child we administer to, every lesson we teach, every action and activity of every day. They've reflected on all of the things they have observed and now feel confident about their own competencies. They are receiving information we never received in our teacher training. There are things that we do in our classrooms that we have learned through hard work—by trial and error—as well as by reading the literature and taking courses over the years. The interns can take advantage of our experience. They are coming out much better prepared than any group I have ever seen.

—Kyser, Evans, Brown, and Gritton, clinical teachers, and Bush, principal, Wheeler Elementary School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

I come to this project with the typical liberal arts person's distrust of education courses. This is a product of years of listening to education students and teachers dismissing education courses as a waste of time. At the same time I never subscribed to the notion that all you needed to teach was a good liberal arts education. I know from the casualty rate of new teachers that there is much to be learned about teaching and that proper preparation of teachers is as important as it is rare.

—Quinn, project director, New York City

Contributions to the School Curriculum

Question 6. What kind of contribution has the clinical schools project made on the development of the knowledge base of the content that is taught and the ability to adapt the curriculum to current needs of students?

Much of the energy of the reform movement of the 1980s was addressed to the quality and extent of knowledge a teacher should have to be able to teach the content of the school curriculum. Debates were heaviest in reference to elementary teachers who are expected to be prepared to teach the content of mathematics, the sciences, language arts, and social studies together with the processes of reading, writing, speaking, and socializing. The importance of the mastery of content knowledge has lead to an increased focus on the extent of liberal arts, sciences, and mathematics course sequences within teacher preparation requirements.

Inasmuch as the clinical experience focuses on the teaching process as it interacts with subject matter, there is the expectation of growth in a student teacher's ability to relate his or her knowledge to the demands of the

curriculum and, thereby, reveal the level of content competency of the student teacher. There is also opportunity to learn the content in new ways of delivery through involvement with a clinical teacher. The responses reflect this is aspect of the collaboratives.

"The Voices"

Participation in the clinical schools project has increased dialogue about what is involved in keeping superior teachers current both in their content knowledge base and their teaching competence. While it is extremely clear that inservice work is imperative, its nature and frequency is still under consideration. When has there been enough training? On what basis do you stop? We don't know the answers.

—*Walker, site coordinator, and Senita, project assistant, Dade County, Florida*

As midcareer students, these interns are more mature. They have their degrees and work experience; thereby, they bring both considerable knowledge and varied life experiences into their teacher preparation programs. Working with them has given me a new lens with a sharper focus and sharper insights. I find I must be better informed to handle their questions and concerns. The knowledge base of their content area is also enhanced by their work experiences. The way they approach assignments and their teaching is incredibly impressive. They go out of their way to seek information beyond a general level of knowledge, and try hard to make it relevant to their learners.

—*Kulawiec, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine*

The interns have taught me much about teacher education. As a teacher educator, I find it exhilarating to see how interns bring their varied life experiences into the classroom. They know their disciplines, but see them primarily as tools for inquiry and for solving social problems. They do not separate their disciplines into little boxes of different subjects, rather they see a blending within the sciences, mathematics, and the language arts. This insight goes a long way into recognizing the need for interrelatedness of the students' learning experiences and the value of interdisciplinary curriculum approaches.

Over the years I have learned to ask the question, What would happen if..., because I have learned that the question provides a way to challenge the status quo. When interns have needed a few additional credits for certification in their discipline, I asked the question, Would a professor in the mathematics department work with this intern in an independent study in geometry? As a result, we have expanded our Arts and Sciences connection to include

preparation of a directory from which interns make contact with potential mentors within the appropriate discipline. As a further result, we now have Arts and Sciences faculty members working with the teachers in the clinical schools on curriculum articulation concerns between high school and college.

—*Broyles, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine*

Impact on Institutional Barriers

Question 7. How has the clinical schools project helped to minimize the effect of institutional barriers that have made the collaborative enterprise difficult?

Historically, institutions of higher education have had responsibility for teacher preparation programs and have requested that school systems and selected teachers assist by allowing student teachers (and more recently, interns) to come into their classrooms to practice teach. From this basic premise over the years, a variety of cooperative or somewhat collaborative models have developed. As Clark reports in the introduction, no clear model of practical teaching experience exists that results in new teachers who are excellently prepared to walk into their own classrooms and begin to teach efficiently and effectively. Many problems surround the concept of the student teaching experience at all levels—student teachers, teachers, and the involved institutions. The responses show how the clinical schools project has enabled participants to circumvent some of the historical problems.

"The Voices"

The Arts and Sciences theme of our project has caused me to take more seriously the dialogue that must happen between deans of various colleges within the university. The dean of Arts and Sciences and I have talked about how they need to play a larger role, and how we can facilitate that even in small ways. As a result, we agreed to consult one another as we write grant proposals to see if there is a chance for collaboration. With the clinical schools project as a basis, we have gained self-confidence in working with university units such as the law school. We recently collaborated with the law school in writing a grant proposal for preparing teachers. This comes as an outgrowth of understanding from the clinical schools project that there are more players in the education of teachers than just the college of education.

—*Moore, dean, College of Education, Gorham, Maine*

The solution we've adopted is to tinker with the gears, but not to try to overhaul the transmission. The modesty of our approach reflects not a lack of confidence, but a recognition that the only way to eat an elephant is one bite

at a time. We've reconciled the two clocks of the two cultures. The school clock runs from approximately 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.; the university clock runs from about 2 p.m. to 9 p.m. as it is a graduate school of education. The two calendars offer equal diversity, with the schools operating from the first week of September to the last week of June while the university operates from the second week of September to the last week of May with a long break between December 22 and the first of February. What this calls for (and has generally and generously been offered) is more flexibility on the part of the participating college people making room in tight schedules without fanfare. While both school and college faculties have multiple and complex time demands, the college people have flexibility of scheduling that no classroom teacher has.

Space limitations created another concern. Prior to my arrival, a college person was seen as desirable for project director, and it was agreed that I would be housed in the school building. But no office space in the school building was available, and all participants of the project expressed a need for office and conferencing space. To reduce the initial anticollege bias, we used the "college's space" for my office *and* for conference and workshop space.

—*Quinn, project director, New York City*

I asked, "How can we improve communications between and among the university and the schools?" We found a unique tool in the university electronic bulletin board system. It is much more than a direct link to the schools; it is a window to the world. Interns regularly communicate with their peers with whom they had established strong collegial ties during the courses, but now are assigned to different schools. They share ideas and raise concerns, thereby using the system to increase their reflective thinking. We are now working to get the teachers to use the system to communicate across the district and the state, and to begin to discover data bases that can be made available for their students.

—*Broyles, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine*

When you talk partnership between university and schools, it is like a marriage. We both contribute to a budget because we both benefit. I am encouraged by school administrators recognizing that because of the quality of experiences the paid interns are having, they make excellent substitute teachers for their cooperating teachers. By saving funds spent on substitute teachers for the cooperating teachers, the schools can afford to put money into teacher seminars, professional conferences, and other professional development activities. In addition, the funds provide support for university follow-up visits to first-year teachers.

Our secondary teacher education program is a graduate-level program,

while our elementary teacher education program is at the undergraduate level. Now that we have documented the success of the clinical schools project at the secondary level, we have restructured our college to bring together these programs. We know we need to be able to immerse our students full-time in the clinical experience on a long-term basis.

—Moore, dean, College of Education, Gorham, Maine

Within the clinical schools project, my student teacher came to me in August, approximately two weeks before the opening of school. At that time he knew the requirements of the university for his teaching experience, so we shared that information and began to plan a strategy for achieving the established goals. Therefore, I am comfortably organized for the whole semester of the student teaching experience.

The university supervisor was here more often, which allowed us to really share what skills and competencies the student teacher needed to work on. In the past there lacked a plan or clear set of expectations; the university supervisor would simply stop by and say, "How are things going?"

—Rudolph, Noe, and Peercy, clinical teachers, and Harbison, principal, Lassiter Middle School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

The clinical schools project has certainly made for more exciting teaching in the classroom. Over the past few years, our student teachers from the University of Louisville have stimulated meaningful dialogue between professors in the education department and the faculty here at the high school. I think one of the big things to come out of this close association is that we feel tangible benefits from the networking that has taken place. We've had a number of meetings here in the school about the student-teaching process, and are aware of how the university is modifying its teacher preparation programs.

—Powell and Streibel, cooperating teachers, Fairdale High School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

We developed this handbook that explains our philosophy and our goals. I think because we had to sit down as a team and write it all down, it helped. It was a team effort and the trainees could see that. That we're involved in many of the district's restructuring efforts has been good for the trainees and the teachers. As a result of team efforts, we are much more than a traditional setting.

I think that being a clinical training site raises the level of professionalism for teachers who are already experts at their work. It gives them opportunity to share their knowledge with future teachers. It also raises the expectations of the teachers for themselves and for the principal. When someone is coming

to you for training, you get better at whatever you do as you train because you are selling yourself and them on the merits of specific strategies that help children to be successful in school. That's the biggest plus for me in this project.

—*Kyser, Evans, Brown, and Gritton, clinical teachers, and Bush, principal, Wheeler Elementary School, Jefferson County, Kentucky*

Each week at least one committee related to the professional development center meets either at the school or the university. Participants include teacher leaders, clinical teachers, coordinators, administrators, and university representatives. Sometimes meetings are scheduled during the day and sometimes after school. All aspects of the collaborative are involved in professional development planning and delivery; all meetings involve professional growth, interactive communication, sharing of knowledge, values, and processes. The result is the development of an innovative program and greater professional stimulation.

—*Gosney, site coordinator, Seattle, Washington*

The division between universities and schools related to research has been so strong that teachers define research as abstract and irrelevant. Within the project we are helping teachers to understand that research done in one's own classroom can be more useful and just as valid as typical university-initiated quantitative research. We are working toward the concept of "teacher-as-researcher" to contribute further to enhancing the preparation of new teachers through the clinical schools project.

—*Hursh, project evaluator, Rochester, New York*

I am aware now of how a good teacher and an ineffective teacher affect the future of a community. The clinical schools project taught me that I have a responsibility to the community to be the best teacher I can be so that my teaching will positively affect the future adult members of the community. Various projects of the school taught us about improving the lives and attitudes of all members of the community.

—*Hofer, intern, Dade County, Florida*

Results and Recommendations

Question 8. What end-product results, observations, conclusions, or recommendations can you cite as having grown out of the clinical schools project?

The multitude of experiences from the concentrated effort within the seven diverse project sites, each using different approaches to improve the student teaching experience, will result in some model features or approaches that may serve as exemplars to other program development activities. The

responses demonstrate the depth of feeling among this diverse group of professionals that each of their roles is important to the preparation of new teachers. This group also is interested in quality of instruction and job longevity.

"The Voices"

Participation in the clinical schools project has forced the district to reexamine selection criteria for supervising teachers. Being a teacher who is considered to be "a master" is not sufficient. While possession of an advanced degree is possibly a defensible requisite, it is not a guarantee of ability. After the right teachers have been selected—on the basis of a functional set of criteria—they must participate in a thorough training plan to ensure their preparation for the role as clinical teachers. Trainers should include lead teachers in the school, as well as university faculty members; and course content needs to include observation skills, organizational procedures, record-keeping, analytical and evaluative skills, and conferencing skills.

Dade County school officials have recognized that the directing teachers in the clinical supervisory process must receive supplementary compensation. This compensation is in recognition of the tremendous extra demands, not only of time, but also of emotional and professional commitment.

—Walker, site coordinator, and Senita, project assistant, Dade County, Florida

The elementary school collaborators decided early in the planning stage that they wanted to induct prospective teachers into a collaborative and collegial model of teaching. They decided the best way to do that was to model collaboration and collegiality themselves. Much to their surprise, they committed themselves to establish teaching teams; a student teacher would be included with each teacher in a team. They established tough experiential requirements as one of the criteria for team selection. Seven teams were formed and selected, several proposed teams decided to watch for a year, and several others were rejected because they did not meet the established criteria.

During the first year, personal and professional sacrifices accumulated as a result of the additional time required for teaming (one teacher said she kissed her personal life good-bye and another delayed her wedding for six months), but the seven teams remained intact and are motivated to continue. Rather than suffering alone as has often been the plight of teachers, they were laughing together and supporting one another. They also were aware that they were learning from one another. They had grown to talk about "our kids" rather than "my kids" and to recognize that team members can compensate for one another's weak areas of subject matter or skill to the great advantage

of enhanced learning for the students. It is also easier to try new teaching processes and strategies when team members are supporting you, rather than to have to struggle alone without that support. Participation in teaming enhanced sharing, which over time enhanced risk taking. This eventually enhanced the quality of student and teacher experiences through creative teaching units and approaches for students and professional support from colleagues.

—Snyder, evaluator, New York City

Rather than acting as a bridge between the school and the university this year, I sometimes feel estranged from my school program and more fragmented in the professional development center activities as a whole. It is becoming evident to me how many accommodations are required from all of the stakeholders to form a school-university partnership. The use of time and the lack of it always becomes a barrier when change is occurring. We need to study the various time constraints and develop unique models to eliminate or diminish their ability to block renewal.

—Brantigan, clinical teacher and university teaching associate, Seattle, Washington

As a result of working with the interns, I think their methods learned on campus tended to be more theoretical than practical, and that the interns are not really prepared for the specifics of teaching. Instead of leaving the school at the end of the day and going to campus for their courses, the courses and the faculty members should come to the school and involve us in the development and delivery of the courses. The teachers here could model lessons and then discuss their merits and specific purposes. We could really teach them cooperative learning strategies; they could observe us during the day and discuss the strategies in class at night. The interns would have hands-on experiences, rather than just the general orientation to various methods that they now seem to be getting.

One of the recommendations that the school faculty and the university personnel made was to develop a three-phase system for the interns. During the first phase, interns would observe in several schools. During the second phase, those students who fit into the Fairdale philosophy of teaching would come here to observe and teach a bit. Then in the third phase, they would student teach with the teacher they had been observing during the second phase. We think the continuity of being at Fairdale for a much longer time makes interns feel more comfortable, helps them understand the student body a bit better, and the teaching staff, and helps them see how to fit into a school of this nature.

—Powell and Streibel, clinical teachers, Fairdale High School, Jefferson County, Kentucky

Because we have applied the cohort process to the intern program, I teach interns on campus during the fall and then move with them in the spring into the schools. The continuity component is an impressive part of this program. Now I can join their postprogram meetings and actually go into the field to see them perform. I videotape episodes for their professional portfolio. This dialogue and exchange keeps our relationship very much alive. The icing on the cake is when they come back for their master's courses; we continue our dialogue that began two or three years ago on professional teaching issues.

—Kulawiec, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine

In response to the question, Why do some of our interns quit their first teaching jobs? we began to look at teacher education as a continuum. Through our project we established a joint stewardship of the university and the clinical school for beginning teachers. I conduct bimonthly seminars; Ed Kulawiec and each former cooperating teacher visits their school for observations and discussions, meeting with the school administrators and the school's peer support teams. As a result of these experiences, I now see the inservice teacher in our master's program as a model of the reflective and inquiring teacher that I hope each intern will become.

—Broyles, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine

Since I was involved in the original design, development, and implementation of the clinical schools project, I am especially pleased to see its growth. I continue to be very active in this project. The greatest impact on my role as Dean of the College of Education has been in the areas of relationships and resources. The clinical school model absolutely forces the dean to be in dialogue with peers in the public school: the superintendents. In the past these connections may have been perfunctory, but now we are in the teacher education business together.

We have shown through the clinical schools project and the Southern Maine Partnership that we are already actively involved with the public schools in decision-making and policy development for school renewal and restructuring, and that we have connected teacher education to that renewal in schools. We clearly demonstrated through the clinical schools project that we value the school partnerships and that we can successfully work in partnership. We already have the trust of the schools; we can dialogue and share responsibility. In addition, our source for funding the new middle school program was impressed that we already had a model secondary program—the site of our clinical schools project.

—Moore, dean, College of Education, Gorham, Maine

At the University of Southern Maine we have engaged in hours and hours of talking about teacher education. This recording of our voices has been a wonderful opportunity to truly hear ourselves. I can clearly hear a special theme with variations: a vision of excellence, a commitment to partnerships, and opportunities for personal and professional growth by each stakeholder in the process of restructuring teacher education. Through the clinical schools project, we are bringing educators together. The voices that resonate for change exist at every level. And, there is harmony between the university and the schools in renewing schools and teacher education.

—Broyles, university supervisor, Gorham, Maine

The key insight that emerged from our clinical schools project and that dominates our design is this: Student teaching and the first year of teaching should be linked to provide the beginner with a coherent, structured introduction to the profession. The notion that student teaching by itself provides sufficient preparation for teaching in the current social environment has cost us too much. Among new teachers it has created two types of dropouts: the physical dropout and the spiritual one. Both result in a tremendous cost to society.

Another key learning is that partnerships cannot exist without continuous, complete, open communication among all of the stakeholders involved in the partnership. This communication must be both formal and informal, and must be addressed to the mission. When communication breaks down, there is no partnership, only competing factions.

In designing a program, always leave room for inspiration. Some of the most gratifying developments in our partnership were not part of the design, but grew from the experience and excitement of individual participants. In January, for example, we inaugurated a series of interdisciplinary units at one of our schools in which teams of student teachers would experience an intense, month-long, across-the-disciplines introduction to teaching. This unique program grew out of the conception of one faculty member at Teachers College who asked herself the question that underlies the entire project: What do aspiring teachers need that they are not getting?

—Quinn, project director, New York City

The intensive year-long internship in the clinical schools project enabled me to see that the teacher's span of influence envelops much more than her classroom. It includes the whole school, peers, the students, their parents, and the whole community.

—Hofer, intern, Dade County, Florida

MESSAGES FROM THE COLLECTED VOICES

BY C. RAYMOND ANDERSON, EDITOR

The voices of the clinical schools project participants present some powerful statements that respond to the mission of AACTE as expressed by Executive Director David Imig and Ford Foundation consultant Edward Meade, as well as to the concerns and needs expressed by Richard Clark in his introduction. The voices express with clarity, sincerity, and enthusiasm the benefits of focusing on the clinical teaching experience in the reform of teacher preparation.

That each project site has operated freely in terms of program design and organizational structure, as well as in relation to site priorities and processes, we feel assures us they will provide a wide range of models for adoption or adaptation. A great diversity of philosophies, priorities, locales, and circumstances create needs unique for forming collaboratives across the nation. The voices from these projects are loud and clear on a number of issues that have grown out of the division of responsibility for the field experience (clinical experience) component of teacher preparation and teacher induction as these have been widely practiced heretofore.

"Teaching in isolation has been dramatically reduced," says a principal. "Team teaching has given me the freedom and confidence to experiment and become a better teacher," says a classroom teacher. School-based teachers are sharing the teaching of university methods courses and seminars on the college campus. College and university faculty are modeling teaching strategies in public school classrooms and learning from the teachers, the interns, and the students. All players are involved in observations and critiques. Institutional barriers are down; cooperative planning and feedback are regularly occurring, natural components of the collaboratives. University deans are planning and

sharing resources with school district superintendents, and principals are working with their teachers in developing new school policies, schedules, practices, and financial arrangements. This atmosphere of equality of roles provides a rich environment for cooperative learning and reflective self-development among all the participants of the enterprise—teachers, student teachers and interns, university faculty and administrators, union representatives, and school administrators.

These outcomes result from the dialogue that is a required component of the collaboratives. Each category of participant has agreed to become a member of the collaborative with an acknowledgment that everyone will give something and that each will receive an equitable share of the responsibility and rights. All sites report long discussions, numerous conferences and training sessions, and lots of sharing to develop a new spirit of collaboration for preparing and inducting teachers.

The "teacher voices" tell us that a clinical teacher (supervising teacher, cooperating teacher) must be more than just a "good teacher" or a teacher with a master's degree. These teachers must meet established selection criteria, and participate in specific training in a number of skills appropriate to a supervisor, administrator, counselor, observer, evaluator, researcher, and model. The extent of training and experience required to perform satisfactorily justifies this being a long-term role and title with appropriate released time and premium salary paid by the school and/or the university. Yet, to remain effective the clinical teacher must continue to teach or team teach in the classroom, and perhaps in the university program.

The student teacher/intern "voices" collected here inform us that they feel "systematically nurtured and trained" in a structured environment. Students say the environment supports their goal of becoming an effective and thoroughly competent first-year teacher. These conclusions grow out of the ongoing dialogue between the university faculty and the clinical teachers about the goals and expectations for the student teachers, about one another's roles, about the preparation of the student teachers before their arrival in the schools, and about the preparation to be provided by the schools. The school and university have agreed on the basis for evaluating and critiquing the student teachers, and they have the opportunity to receive feedback from the cooperating teacher, the site coordinator, and the university supervisor.

These processes and activities obviously are not unique to the schools in this project, as there are many effective, well-planned collabo-

rative or cooperative clinical teaching arrangements functioning. However, these activities are new for some of these sites and are recognized as outstandingly better than the former practices. The climate in which student teaching is occurring now at these sites has developed from the unified effort of the constituents in the collaborative. In the situations in which the students are selected into a cohort, the students, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors agree that this is a most efficient and effective approach to students' professional development.

Some project sites have lengthened the time frame for the clinical experience from one semester to two and have changed the sequence from the traditional last semester of the program. The changed pattern places the student teachers/interns in a semester of guided observation in the school and a semester of student teaching in that school, or in two semesters of student teaching together with simultaneous university methods courses and seminars. The longer time span for the clinical school experience and the well-defined school-university partnership contrast with programs that may require only six or eight weeks of student teaching placed in the middle of some semester, and that run without collaborative agreements. Voices of student teachers/interns, cooperating teachers, project coordinators, and university supervisors express appreciation for the long, continuous time span devoted to the in-school experience. These expressions are also accompanied by a recognition of opportunity for developing a natural continuum that begins with the preservice student's in-school observations and student teaching experience, carries through a first-year induction program, and moves into a professional development program. There is merit in working toward having the same clinical teachers, site coordinators, and university faculty involved in all phases of the continuum.

Most of the collaboratives have provided specific focus on preparing the student teachers to work in a multicultural environment of students. The student teachers express how difficult it is to comprehend this area of preparation until they experience the reality of diverse cultures and abilities among the students they must teach. The learning theories and discussions of ways to deal with diversity only have meaning after first-hand experience with the classroom teacher. Being able to observe and model the clinical teacher's behavior and practices in individualizing the instruction is meaningful and effective. Therefore, it seems that preparation for effectiveness in individualizing instruction according to multicultural and learning ability differences is enhanced by the programs that offer student teaching together with methods courses and

seminars. Documentation of these policies and practices may well evolve into a set of guidelines for dissemination to other programs.

The voices of a variety of participants cited the need for schools and universities to seek appropriate funding to support the collaborative model of clinical experiences for preservice teachers. The collaborative process is expensive in time and resource consumption. Student teachers and interns need an income to support a year of full-time in-school experience. These costs appear justified because the lengthy induction period contributes to a student's sense of commitment to the profession and serves as an excellent base for teacher recruitment. Clinical teachers need appropriate time allocations for structured observations, conferencing, planning, report preparation, and training development activities. Clinical schools need a coordinator to maintain the necessary continuous dialogue, planning, and development; the program needs an advisory committee, and an ongoing professional development effort. University faculty need a reduction in teaching load to compensate for the heavy time commitment as a member of a collaborative school team. Compensation is needed for the additional burden of effort contributed by the various team players. Many schools also have a critical shortage of space and cannot provide adequately for team teacher meetings, conferences, materials preparation, workshops, and seminars.

Schools and universities involved in these projects developed creative ways to fund some of these efforts. "Reallocated time and compensation for meetings after school hours have empowered the supervisors and the cooperating teachers, and have strengthened their commitment to the student teachers," says a site coordinator. With salaried teaching interns in the school, another site found it was possible to save substitute teacher funds and divert these to cover the costs of staff development and curriculum improvement projects. A college of education dean in one project provides budgeted funds in support of the collaborative.

A variety of voices from the clinical schools tell us that a school's involvement in teacher preparation as a collaborative (like a teaching hospital) is good for everybody. The whole character of the school becomes electric. Teachers, students, and student teachers become excited. Inquiry processes become an accepted expectation for everyone. Teachers want to be involved in the seminars with the interns; teachers who were reluctant to share ideas with one another decided for themselves to become "teaching teams." One teacher says, "In fourteen years of teaching, this is the first time in my career that anyone has listened

to me. Now with the collaborative, I have a voice." Teachers share their knowledge and strategies with other teachers, as well as with the student teachers and interns—and the students' lives are enriched by all of the generated energy and the more focused attention they receive.

The voices through the use of "their" professional language indicate indirectly how important it is to codify the "education-ese" in use. It has been difficult to write explicitly about the projects and their activities because we have no agreed upon meanings for our words. For instance, some project sites (clinical schools, collaboratives, professional development centers) enroll only graduate students earning master's degrees and having their initial "supervised student teaching experience" (field experience, clinical experience, internship, practicum); they are called *interns*. Some interns are salaried; some are not. Undergraduate students undergoing their initial "supervised student teaching experience" are called *student teachers* in most programs, but sometimes they are called *interns* and sometimes *trainees*.

The classroom teacher who, in a historical sense, supervised the student teacher's initial "practice teaching experience" was said to be cooperating with the university and is, therefore, a cooperating teacher, but may now also be a clinical teacher, a directing teacher, a supervising teacher, or a mentor. The voices collected here most often referred to them as clinical teachers, but not consistently so. Likewise, the site coordinator may also be a project director, trainer, lead teacher, inservice coordinator, or site liaison.

As our profession moves to reform first-hand teaching experiences in the classroom for preservice teachers, we need to be sure that we clarify our language to assure consistent understanding. The project's national advisory committee has requested that some effort be devoted to codifying the language among the collaboratives.

Although little of the initial anxieties of participants became a part of the commentary reported here, the voices of the projects also communicated their initial anxieties about changing present practice. They expressed anxieties, including the fear of open dialogue, the fear that new selection, assessment, and evaluation criteria would expose them to criticism, and the fear of being incapable of fulfilling the new expectations. In various ways, the voices reflected dissatisfaction with the status quo in terms of continuing historic practices in schooling and in teacher preparation that no longer relate to the realities of public schooling and to current societal values and priorities.

Readers who work in other school/university partnerships or other cooperative arrangements for preservice teacher education may wonder what is new in the AACTE/Ford Foundation project. It seems to us, by way

of conclusion, that we have presented the voices of a group of professionals who are engaged in an experiment and whose views are not unlike their peers throughout the nation. Therefore, readers can identify with the emotions, joy and fear, satisfactions, the stress, and the hope expressed by these voices.

We can conclude:

- That the project results support a collaborative plan that requires participation of a school system, with some of its teachers and administrators, university faculty and administrators, and representatives of the teacher organization(s) of the system, and all share equally in the rights and responsibilities for the clinical teaching component of teacher education.
- That the collaborative provides for dialogue and agreement among the constituents relative to all aspects of policy, plans, and procedures for the development and delivery of a most appropriate clinical experience for preservice teachers.
- That the dialogue also includes (a) ways to fund the collaborative including appropriate compensation for those involved according to the workload and responsibility, (b) scheduling changes to accommodate the needs of the key players, and (c) requirements for space and accommodating facilities.
- That the clinical experience be at least a year long with provision for shared time for methods courses and seminars, and that school faculty join university faculty in teaching these courses and seminars.
- That clinical teachers and university faculty share in the observation, analysis, and critique the student teachers' performance, and that among other things during the clinical experience, specific training and demonstration be devoted to preparation for teaching children with diverse multicultural backgrounds and learning abilities.
- That criteria be developed to select and train clinical teachers, and that "effective teaching" be identified as a basis for evaluating the student teachers.
- That criteria be developed to admit students to the clinical program, and that the students be treated as a cohort working with a team of school and university faculty throughout the clinical program.
- That the clinical training team address the continuum of experiences appropriate to the preservice teacher, the induction of first-year teachers, and the continuous needs for professional development and renewal.

REFERENCES

Arends, R. 1990. *Learning to teach*. (2nd ed.) NY: McGraw Hill.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. 1986. *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, D.C.

Cogan, M. L. 1973. *Clinical supervisor*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Conant, J. B. 1963. *The education of American teachers*. New York: McGrawHill.

Goodlad, J. I. 1984. *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. 1990. *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Griffin, G. A. 1986. Crossing the bridges: The first years of teaching. In T.J. Lasley (Ed.) *The dynamics of change in teacher education*: Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Haberman, M. 1971. Twenty-three reasons why universities can't educate teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 22:133-140.

Holmes Group. 1990. *Tomorrow's schools*. East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. 1986. *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group.

Mead, M. L. 1990. Clinical schools project: Summary report 1 (Preimplementation Phase). Unpublished.

Mead, M. L. 1990. Clinical schools project: Summary report 2 (Implementation Phase). Unpublished.

Meade, E. J., Jr. 1990. Reshaping the clinical phase for preparing teachers. Keynote address for conference on The Development of the Education Profession Through Partnerships, of the Minnesota Department of Education, 30 October, St. Cloud, Minnesota.

APPENDIX A
PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

FLORIDA

Dade County
Karen Hofer, intern, University of Miami; Maria Ray, intern, University of Miami; Gail Senita, project assistant; Kenneth D. Walker, Ph.D., project director, Dade County Public Schools.

KENTUCKY

Jefferson County, Louisville
Donna C. Seaford, project liaison, Jefferson County Public Schools/Gheens Academy.
Maralyn Lewis Brown, Doris Evans, Janice L. Deeb Gritton, and Hazel Kyser, clinical teachers; and Charlene Bush, principal, Wheeler Elementary School.
Patricia Noe, Joan Peercy, and Sarah G. Rudolph, clinical teachers; and Fred Harbison, principal, Lassiter Middle School.
Jacqueline Powell and Jim Streibel, clinical teachers, Fairdale High School.

MAINE

Southern Maine, Gorham
India Broyles, Ed.D., program director and university supervisor; Edwin Kulawiec, Ph.D., university supervisor; and Dorothy Moore, Ph.D., dean, College of Education, University of Southern Maine.

NEW YORK

New York City
Edward Quinn, Ph.D., project director; and Jon Snyder, project evaluator, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Rochester
David Hursh, Ph.D., project evaluator and assistant professor, University of Rochester; and Michael J. Rohan, principal, John Williams Elementary School, Rochester City Schools.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pittsburgh

Philip Flynn and Bryan D. Freehling, interns, University of Pittsburgh at Schenley High School; and Charles Granigan, site liaison, Pittsburgh School District.

WASHINGTON

Seattle

Nanna S. Brantigan, clinical teacher, Puget Sound Professional Development Center at College Place Middle School, and teaching associate, University of Washington; and K. D. Gosney, site coordinator, Puget Sound Professional Development Center at Odle Middle School.

APPENDIX B
SITE DESCRIPTIONS

DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

GRANTEE: Ford Foundation, Clinical Supervision Project

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

Dade County Public Schools
University of Miami
Florida International University
United Teachers of Dade

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

Cutler Ridge Elementary School (Students, 736 - Teachers, 58)

Cutler Ridge Elementary School is situated in Cutler Ridge, a suburb 20 miles south of Miami's inner city. The student population is drawn primarily from two areas: the Cutler Ridge neighborhood and two low-income housing projects. Of the 736 students in grades K-5, 49% are White, 31% are Black, 19% are Hispanic, and 1% is Asian/American Indian. Approximately 42% receive free/reduced priced lunch. There are 15 gifted students, 91 handicapped students, and 97 children receive compensatory education. The mean score on the standardized tests tend to somewhat exceed the 50th percentile.

Olinda Elementary School (Students, 751 - Teachers, 52)

Olinda Elementary School is an inner city school. The student population is drawn from both single family homes and low-income housing projects. Of the 751 students in grades K-6, 2% are White, 95% are Black, and 3% are Hispanic. Approximately 83% received free/reduced priced lunch. There are 89 gifted students, 51 handicapped, and approximately 441 who receive compensatory education. The standardized test scores range primarily between the upper end of the 1st quartile and the lower end of the 2nd quartile.

Sunset Elementary School (Students, 713 - Teachers, 75)

Sunset Elementary School is located in the suburbs in southern Dade County. Its grade configuration is K-2 and 3-6. Its student population is predominantly White and Hispanic, with only 22% Black students. Of the 713 students, 52 are in the gifted program, 58 are handicapped, and 36 receive compensatory education. Approximately 18% receive free/reduced priced lunch. The mean score on standardized tests tend to cluster around the 80 to 90 percentile.

Centennial Middle School (Students, 1,257 - Teachers, 90)

Centennial Middle School is located in south Dade County and is one of the feeder schools for Southridge Senior High School. Of the 1,257 students at Centennial, 51% are White, 31% are Black, 17% are Hispanic, and 2% are Asian/American Indian. Twenty-seven percent receive free/reduced priced lunch, and 61 students receive compensatory education. Centennial has a large exceptional student program, with 161 handicapped and 30 gifted children. The median score on standardized tests in reading and math clustered around the 75th percentile.

Southridge Senior High School (Students, 3,028 - Teachers, 221)

Miami Southridge Senior High School is located in southern Dade County. It is built on 63 acres and serves five different communities: Perrine, South Miami Heights, Cutler Ridge, Whispering Pines, and Goulds. Of the 3,028 students, 28% are White, 41% are Black, 29% are Hispanic, and 2% are Asian/American Indian. Slightly more than 14% receive free/reduced priced lunch. There are 290 students enrolled in the exceptional student program. The mean score on standardized tests in math computation, reading, and language arts clustered around the 50th percentile.

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS:

One year for all student teachers/interns.

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS PER YEAR:

School	1989-90	1990-91
Cutler Ridge Elementary	10	15
Olinda Elementary	—	5
Sunset Elementary	14	11
Centennial Middle	7	1
Southridge Senior High	5	0

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS:

School	Number of Teachers
Cutler Ridge Elementary	18
Olinda Elementary	10
Sunset Elementary	11
Centennial Middle	8
Southridge Senior High	11

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

In the spirit of the teacher education currently underway, the Dade County Public School System has established clinical training centers in collaboration with two local universities and the United Teachers of Dade to provide practical training for preservice teachers. The project is designed to implement the practice teaching phase of the preservice teacher training programs. Five schools, three elementary, one middle, and one senior high, representing the multicultural diversity of the community, have been identified as clinical training centers. These schools are considered centers of excellence and have outstanding faculties, administrative staffs, and diverse student populations. Roughly 30 to 40 interns per year, both elementary and secondary level, are selected from each of the two participating universities (Florida International University and University of Miami) and are matched with outstanding directing teachers for a period of one year.

The most salient characteristics of the clinical supervision model for the project are as follows:

1. The major responsibility for the practice-teaching phase of the preservice training of teachers will shift from the university faculty to classroom teachers.
2. The role of directing teacher will be enhanced. More stringent criteria will be applied in the identification and selection process. Upgraded and more extensive training will be provided, and more time allotted for carrying out supervisory responsibilities. Presently, completion of a prescribed 15-day training period is required prior to the assignment of a year-long intern.
3. The internship period will be extended from the customary nine to eighteen weeks to a full year.
4. Activities explicitly designed to develop rapport between the intern and the directing teacher will be provided. The literature cites this rapport as the single most critical aspect of the clinical supervision model.
5. The purpose of classroom observation will be to collect data regarding the interns' effectiveness on critical dimensions of the teaching process and to identify professional growth experiences that should be provided. Major techniques used to collect data are the techniques of selective verbatim audiotapes and videotapes.
6. The classroom observation of teaching will be regularly preceded and followed by formal conferences each day.
7. There will be a gradual increase in the amount of teaching responsibility assigned to the intern, commencing with total responsibility of two classes, after a nine-week orientation and "teacher assistance" phase.
8. The daily schedule already allocates time for interns to observe exemplary teaching behaviors. In the future, interns will participate in biweekly inservice activities.

9. Regular staffing formulas will be enriched slightly for participating schools to secure adequate time for directing teachers to conduct the required conferences.
10. A formal evaluation of the project will be conducted annually.

PUBLICATIONS:

"Bless'd Be the Ties That Bind: Creating a Productive Work Culture in Training Programs," Lore A. Nielsen and Ava G. Belitzky
Florida ASCD Journal, vol. 6, 1990, pp 18-23.

CONTACT PERSON:

Dr. Kenneth D. Walker, Executive Director
Bureau of Human Resource Development
Division of Instructional Personnel Training
1080 Labaron Drive
Miami Springs, FL 33166
(305) 887-2002

JEFFERSON COUNTY, KENTUCKY

GRANTEE: Center for Leadership in School Reform

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

Jefferson County Public Schools
University of Louisville
Jefferson County Teachers Association

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

Elementary Schools

Chenoweth Elementary ■ 5 Phase Students; 2 Student Teachers; 2 Experimental Student Teachers; 1 Intern. A K-5 school of 500 students, Chenoweth has one multiage team and five single-grade teaching teams. The focus of the induction process was to involve trainees in curriculum issues, specifically reading and writing instruction.

Price Elementary ■ 12 Phase Students; 3 Student Teachers; 2 Experimental Student Teachers; 1 Intern. Price has 600 K-5 students divided among three multiage teams, regular and advanced program, and single-teacher classes. The staff and school induction coordinator have offered a half-day orientation for trainees and a staff retreat on induction.

Wheeler Elementary ■ 15 Phase Students; 7 Student Teachers; 3 Experimental Student Teachers. Wheeler has an enrollment of 481 students in six multiage teams. The school has developed a formal, written mission statement for the trainees assigned to their teams.

Middle Schools

Conway Middle ■ 10 Block Students; 8 Student Teachers; 3 Interns. Conway Middle has 776 students divided among six interdisciplinary teams and one related arts team. The staff provided a formal orientation meeting prior to trainees' work in the school and held a formal ceremony at the end of the trainees' stay at the school.

Lassiter Middle ■ 5 Block Students; 2 Student Teachers. Located in southwest Jefferson County, Lassiter Middle School has 750 students spread among two multiage and four single-grade, cross-content teams, and one related arts team. Lassiter's Induction Committee developed an extensive handbook and held a Critical Issues Symposium for all clinical trainees.

High Schools

Fairdale High ■ 8 Student Teachers; 2 Experimental Student Teachers. Fairdale High is a 9-12 comprehensive school with 1,066 students. Trainees were provided with experiences in many restructuring efforts, including "Student As Worker" and "Teacher-Guided Assistance."

Pleasure Ridge Park High ■ 10 Student Teachers; 2 Experimental Student Teachers; 2 Interns. PRP High is a 9-12 comprehensive school with 1,523 students. To enhance their evolution into a clinical site, the staff made a commitment to be trained in peer coaching.

Combined Elementary-Secondary School

Brown School ■ 5 Experimental Student Teachers; 2 Interns. The Brown School is an optional 1-12 institution with 620 students drawn from the entire system. Trainees were involved in the development of schoolwide restructuring initiatives.

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS/ INTERNS:

- 2 days per week for 16 weeks for Block Students
- 3 weeks for Phase Students
- 16 weeks for Student Teachers
- 16 weeks for Experimental Student Teachers
- 1 year for Interns

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS PER YEAR:

- 15 Block Students
- 34 Phase Students
- 42 Student Teachers
- 16 Experimental Student Teachers
- 8 Interns

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS:

Total	**120**
Chenoweth	11
Price	14
Wheeler	23
Conway	20
Lassiter	14
Fairdale	12
PRP	14
Brown	12

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS:

Chenoweth Elementary

Chenoweth, a K-5 school, has 1 multiage and five single-grade teaching teams. Induction activities include the following:

—three staff meetings devoted to the creation of professional practice plans
—placement of trainees in a multiage instructional team

Price Elementary

Price has 600 K-5 students divided among three multiage teams, regular and advanced program, and single-teacher classes.

The staff and school induction coordinator have set up:

—a half-day orientation period for trainees
—opportunities for trainees to work in multi- and single-grade placements
—teams that allow trainees to plan and implement a project together
—opportunities for an individual trainee to assume responsibility for a major project
—a staff retreat with induction as a central focus in June 1990

Wheeler Elementary

Wheeler has an enrollment of 481 students in six multiage, K-5 teams. Its induction includes the following:

—a formal, written permission statement for the school trainees assigned to teams and movement from team to team of these trainees
—an informal mentor arrangement
—involvement of trainees in extracurricular projects
—a coordinator of trainee activities
—a staff retreat in the summer of 1990

Conway Middle School

Conway Middle, located in southwestern Jefferson County, has 776 students divided among six interdisciplinary and one related arts teaching teams. The staff has devised the following induction activities:

—a formal orientation meeting prior to a trainee's work in the school
—an informal school support system

—the assignment of trainees in pairs to a teaching team
—in-school seminars, led by JCPS/Gheens staff, on middle-school-related topics
—a formal ceremony at the end of a trainee's stay at the school
—the development of a clinical trainee handbook

Lassiter Middle School

Lassiter Middle, also located in southwest Jefferson County, has 750 students spread among two multiage, four single grade, and one related arts teaching teams. Its induction plan covers the following:
—a handbook, prepared by the staff, for all clinical trainees
—in-school coordinators for university students involved in clinical assignments
—a Critical Issues Symposium designed for staff and interns to focus on school instructional points
—a staff retreat in June 1990, with induction as a primary issue

Fairdale High School

At Fairdale High, a 9-12 comprehensive school of 1,066 students, the following are part of trainees' induction program:
—teaching experiences with more than one teacher
—participation in meetings of the Fairdale Steering Committee, the primary decision-making body of the school
—access to a math resource room
—personal experience/logging journal entries
—early field work experience where trainees are paired with student teachers
—experience working with teams of teachers who plan a program of involvement in Fairdale restructuring programs (e.g., Student As Worker, Teacher-Guided Assistance, U.S. Is US, an interdisciplinary team)
—formal review of Fairdale High's statement of induction

Pleasure Ridge Park High School

PRP High, a 9-12 comprehensive school of 1,523 students, has developed the following:
—a formal orientation period for clinical trainees
—a mentor program matching teachers and trainees from the same subject areas
—a school support team for each trainee, and space in the school for those teams to meet
—a teaching/learning lab where trainees may experiment with different learning strategies and receive feedback from students in a controlled setting
—training in peer coaching for staff members
—a formal orientation handbook and a collection of successful classroom strategies used by Pleasure Ridge Park teachers

Brown School

The Brown School, an optional 1-12 institution with 620 students, is in the implementation stage of these activities:
—schoolwide interdisciplinary teaching teams

—a loosely coupled elementary structure to permit trainees to experience a variety of instructional settings
—a formal orientation process for trainees
—inclusion of trainees in the development of schoolwide restructuring initiatives
—development of an induction handbook

PUBLICATIONS:

Wheeler Elementary Induction Handbook
Lassiter Middle Induction Handbook
Pleasure Ridge Park High Induction Handbook

CONTACT PERSON:

Dr. Ray Nystrand
University of Louisville
Belknap Campus
Louisville, KY 40292
(502) 588-6411

GORHAM, MAINE

GRANTEE: University of Southern Maine

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

Portland School System—Portland Teachers Association
Westbrook School System—Westbrook Educational Association
Gorham School System—Gorham Teachers Association
Kennebunk School System—Kennebunk Teachers Association
University of Southern Maine

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

Deering High School (Students, 950 - Teachers, 80)
Deering has been in the TSS Program for 8 years.

Gorham High School (Students, 516 - Teachers, 42)
This is Gorham's third year with the TSS Program.

Kennebunk High School (Students, 616 - Teachers, 52).
This school for excellence is now on its second year of the TSS Program.

Portland High School (Students, 945 - Teachers, 85)
This is Portland High School's first year in the program. They lead the state in enrollment of immigrant students.

Westbrook High School (Students, 832 - Teachers, 85)
Westbrook has been in the TSS Program for six years.

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS/ INTERNS:

Fall: 15 weeks, integrated
Spring: 15 weeks, full-time

TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS SERVED PER YEAR:

1988-89 13
1989-90 14
1990-91 24

	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Deering	4	4	6
Portland	—	—	3
Westbrook	5	3	5
Gorham	4	5	5
Kennebunk	—	2	5

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS: 27 (1991)

School	Number of Teachers
Deering	6
Portland	3
Westbrook	7
Gorham	5
Kennebunk	6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The program commitment begins with a weekend of experiential education in late August using Outward Bound-type activities. Self-discovery and group support are enhanced through continued opportunities to explore and extend oneself in Maine's outdoors. After a three-day university orientation, interns are assigned to one clinical training site for the first two weeks of school, including teacher work days. During the third week, they visit each of the other schools for an orientation, tour of facilities, and interviews with teachers. They return to campus for eleven weeks of intensive study in five academic classes on secondary teaching methods, curriculum design and evaluation, adolescent development, reading in the content areas, and teaching the exceptional student in the regular classroom. During this period the interns continue a weekly observation day at one of the clinical sites for dual purposes: (1) to provide concrete examples for reflecting on academic learnings, and (2) to conference with cooperating teachers to identify a satisfactory assignment.

Each course also has a unique role or feature. The adolescent development course uses a "foxfire" approach in which the interns write life stories from interviews

of high school students. An intern selects a theme from which to develop each lesson plan for microteaching in the teaching strategies class. An intern learns how to work with the exceptional student in the regular classroom by writing his/her own contract to accomplish the objectives, and meets for individual conferences with the instructor. The content area reading course is both theoretical in its emphasis on the connections between cognition and literacy, and practical as the instructor uses current high school textbooks to model successful teaching/learning activities. The experiential learning (which includes the Outward Bound activity) is a truly special university course without walls or time boundaries. The inclusion of a curriculum design and evaluation course at the preservice level is unusual, but it is particularly important that our program go beyond a skills approach and advance the interdisciplinary, multicultural, holistic approach to curriculum.

The TSS Program site coordinator is given adjunct professor status with the university plus a small stipend, as well as one additional duty-free period by the school (except for two persons who are department chairpersons and have a reduced teaching load). The site coordinator organizes all school activities, monitors intern/teacher progress, observes interns in a teaching situation, and participates on advisory committees. The role of the cooperating teacher has also been modified and enhanced. An intern may work in a collegial situation with one or multiple teachers within or across departments. Each cooperating teacher observes all the interns in the school as part of further professional growth, and in the following year, visits one intern as a beginning teacher.

The interns complete their transition into teaching two weeks before Christmas break, going to their assigned school for an in-depth study of the school organization and the development of an action plan for the teaching internship, which is scheduled from January through the third grading period in April. During this time the interns meet for a weekly seminar. After the spring break, the interns return to campus for reflection and evaluation, including class sessions with each of their academic instructors from the fall courses.

PUBLICATIONS:

Broyles, I. (1990) *Teachers for Secondary Schools Program Handbook*. Portland: University of Southern Maine.

Broyles, I. (1990) *An Alternative Becomes a Tradition*. Unpublished.

CONTACT PERSON:

Dr. India Broyles
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Southern Maine
220 Bailey Hall
Gorham, ME 04038
(207) 780-5375

NEW YORK CITY

GRANTEE: Teachers College, Columbia University

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

New York City School District #3
Teachers College
The United Federation of Teachers.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

P.S.87 (Elementary School Students, 1,054 - Teachers, 58)

P.S.87 is an elementary school for grades K-5. It is committed to the principle of active learning, heterogeneous grouping, and cultural diversity.

I.S.44 (Intermediate School Students, 950 - Teachers, 70)
I.S.44 is an intermediate school for grades 6-8. It is divided into five mini-schools, all of which stress interdisciplinary study as a key component.

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS/ INTERNS:

The basic program is a two-year graduate program, one year of student teaching, one year of teaching as an intern. An alternative graduate program offers a one-year intensive student-teaching internship.

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS PER YEAR:

1990-91:
P.S.87 - 16 student teachers, 3 teaching interns
I.S.44 - 6 student teachers, 1 teaching intern

NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS:

P.S.87 - 19
I.S.44 - 7

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The basic program provides for the extension of the master's degree program at Teachers College from one year to two. In the second year, selected student-teachers assume positions of teacher-interns, team teaching with two teachers who themselves are functioning as a team. An intern teaches four days a week at four-fifths salary. The fifth day is spent on academic work needed to complete the master's degree requirements.

In the alternative program, students serve as student teachers four days a week for a full year. In May student teachers will team together, taking full control of one class for three weeks.

All participating student-teachers are given a two-day orientation to the program, taught by school faculty and a member of the Teachers College faculty.

An additional innovation introduced this year involves an intense interdisciplinary student-teaching experience at I.S.44. For three weeks in January, during the College intersession, students spend every day at the school working in interdisciplinary teams of four with complementary teams of cooperating teachers. Special interdisciplinary programs, carefully planned, cut across the usual schedules and class hours at the school.

PUBLICATIONS:

Jon Snyder, *Conflict Resolution in a School/University Collaboration to Plan a Professional Development School*, Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1991.

"Teachers College and Two West Side Schools Start Professional Development School," *Holmes Group Forum*, IV, 3 (Spring 1990), 12-13.

CONTACT PERSON:

Dr. Edward Quinn
Project Director
Professional Development School
Teachers College, Box 155
525 West 120th Street
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-3166

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

GRANTEE: Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

Rochester City School District
University of Rochester
Nazareth College of Rochester
State University of New York at Brockport
Rochester Teachers Center
Rochester Teachers Association
Association of School Administrators of Rochester (ASAR)

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

John Williams School No. 5

Grades K-6. Enrollment: 403 plus 166 pre-K special education. The student population is almost equally divided among Black, Asian, and Caucasian students. One-fourth of the student population has special needs. A high mobility rate and a large number of students with limited English proficiency contribute to the low test scores.

Douglass Discovery Magnet

Grades 6-8. Magnet enrollment: 253 regular education students, 36 special education students. School enrollment: 1,314. Five core subjects are taught and an interdisciplinary initiative is proposed. A majority of the students entering are under the 50th percentile in math and reading. The population is predominantly minority.

John Marshall High School

Grades 9-12. Of the 1,419 students in grades 9-12, 53.8% are Black, 6.8% are Hispanic, and 2.3% are Asian. There are 269 handicapped students. The annual dropout rate is 15.5%. In grade 9, approximately 45.6% of the students are one year older than normal. At grade 11, 39.7% are one grade older, and 13.1% are two grades older. This figure decreases because older students tend not to stay in school until their senior year.

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCES FOR STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS:

Nazareth: Full time, last semester of program sequence
Brockport: Full time, last semester of program sequence
University of Rochester: Elementary—full time, graduate year
Secondary—Full time, last semester of program sequence (Spring)

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS PER YEAR:

School	Number of Student Teachers
John Williams School No . 5	8 (Nazareth College)
Douglass Middle School	18-20 (The Discovery Magnet, Brockport)
	1+ (University of Rochester)
John Marshall High School	Planning Year

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS:

School	Number of Teachers
John Williams School No. 5	16 (one special education and one regular education teacher team to work with one student teacher)
Douglass Middle School	18-20
John Marshall High School	Planning Year

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS:

The defining character of the Professional Practice Schools Collaborative in Rochester, New York, is the commitment of participants to induct student teachers into a *community of learners*. The purpose of such a community is to promote dialogue, reflection, and inquiry among all participating, with the goal of improving

student learning. Central to a community of learners is the assumption that every participant (teachers, administrators, parents, pupils, student teachers, teacher educators) is both a teacher and a learner. This notion breaks down the traditional role boundaries and hierarchies in schools, and provides an opening for collaborative inquiry on school practices. In a community of learners, no one has a corner on knowledge; instead, knowledge is viewed as an ongoing process of sense-making that is constructed and revised through interaction.

Building such a community of learners depends on open-mindedness to rethinking expectations and existing practices. Clearly such a project can only succeed in a context of shared responsibility, shared decision-making, shared values, and trust. However arduous the task, the potential benefits are great. By establishing the environment, atmosphere, and incentive to nurture a learning community, we will achieve parity in educational decision-making; equal assumption of responsibility between local education agencies and university researchers; practical, applicable theory development; immediacy of intervention; a process, as well as products, that improve schools and increase educational effectiveness; an educational community that is more likely to articulate problems and move toward solutions.

A community of learners is grounded in a theory of learning as a social process, which locates learning in the interaction rather than the individual (Vygotsky, 1978*). What is learned through interaction is internalized and becomes part of the individual learner's repertoire; this suggests how the ongoing education of teachers in a community that embodies the norms and values of a learning community might positively affect the teaching profession. In the context of a learning community, social interactions provide intellectual stimulation, promote empathy and understanding for different perspectives, and offer an important source of professional and personal satisfaction.

In Rochester, New York, these emergent learning communities will be known as Professional Practice Schools. The symbolic shift from "Clinical Training Sites" to "Professional Practice Schools" is meant to capture the collaboration between school and university professionals, all of which are engaged in ongoing professional development at these sites. Teacher educators and university-based researchers have traditionally seen continuous learning as necessary to the achievement of their professional goals. This has not always been easy with teachers. Professional practice schools assume that the process of becoming a teacher neither begins when students enroll in their first education course nor ends when they're assigned their first classroom; rather, the process includes students' undergraduate liberal arts education and continues throughout their career.

The following data, requested by AACTE to share with other Ford Foundation clinical training programs, illustrate the progress of the Rochester initiative:

- Teams of cooperating teachers worked collaboratively with student teachers and collegiate advisors to help plan and facilitate a variety of experiences for student teachers.

* Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. In M. Cole et al. (Eds.), Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Instead of one cooperating teacher responsible for a student teacher, the teaming of special education and regular education teachers took place at School No. 5. Student teachers at all Rochester City School District sites were encouraged to spend time with support staff (social workers, counselors, psychologists) to better understand student needs. This program was formalized and expanded in the Discovery Magnet, and student teachers visited social service agencies in the community.
- Collegiate faculty met regularly with teams of cooperating teachers and student teachers at each site to discuss teaching/learning issues. Teacher-researcher/teacher-coordinator positions were established and these individuals facilitated all site meetings.
- Teachers at professional practice sites in the Rochester City School District were recruited to lead seminars for student teachers. A SUNY Brockport grant was used to pay Douglass teachers.
- A professional library was set up at each Rochester City School District site, and the reading materials proved invaluable for those who used them. Computers were also available in the professional room at each site.

Proposed Changes in Institutional Practices

To change institutional practices to promote increased professional involvement, and to generate support that will contribute to the success of professional practice sites, institutions of higher education and the Rochester City School District will be discussing the utility of current organizational arrangements and existing policies. Some of the issues identified as critical in improving the teaching/learning process for novices are as follows:

- Make the reward system for cooperating teachers more functional (Most teachers have a master's degree, so additional course work no longer generates salary increases, making the traditional voucher less functional.).
- Provide incentives for collegiate faculty to spend time conducting school-based seminars with cooperating teachers and student teachers. Publication continues to be rewarded in most research institutions, and teaching courses rather than supervision is valued in teaching-oriented colleges. Higher education has to work collaboratively with school districts to identify the mutual rewards of connecting theory and practice.
- Examine the preservice education of college students interested in urban teaching.
- Expand the existing knowledge base of teachers in public schools, perhaps through recruitment of Arts and Science faculty.
- Rethink the role of cooperating teachers in the training, supervision, and evaluation of student teachers.
- Explore the way that inquiry, including teacher research, can contribute to the improvement of student learning.

During the 1990-91 school year, a task force comprised of deans or chairpersons, faculty responsible for teacher education, the Rochester City

School District curriculum coordinator, and the Professional Practice Site staff convened to address these issues.

PUBLICATIONS:

Ford Foundation Reports and Proposals

CONTACT PERSON:

Dr. Ruth Danis, Project Director
Curriculum Development and Support
Rochester City School District
131 West Broad Street
Rochester, NY 14614
(716) 262-8283

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

GRANTEE: Pittsburgh School District/University Collaborative

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

Pittsburgh Public Schools
Duquesne University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers
Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching
Pittsburgh Administrators Association

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

The following schools are all comprehensive urban high schools, grades 9-12. The first three schools are integrated according to the State Human Relations Commission guidelines. George Westinghouse is 100% African-American. Each of these high schools has within its organizational structure in-house magnet programs. Approximately 98% of the teachers have participated in the eight-week professional development program at the Schenley High School Teacher Center.

Carrick High School (Students, 1,383 - Teachers, 90)

Langley High School (Students, 1,085 - Teachers, 79)

Schenley High School Teacher Center (Students, 948 - Teachers, 84)

George Westinghouse High School (Students, 854 - Teachers, 74)

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS:

One semester for student teachers

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/INTERNS PER YEAR:

Student Teachers, 38
Interns, 17

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS:

Clinical Instructors, 111 (both basic and higher education)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Pittsburgh School District/University Collaborative (PSD/UC) is comprised of the Pittsburgh Public Schools (including the Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers and the Pittsburgh Administrators Association), Duquesne University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, the University of Pittsburgh, and the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching. A year-long planning effort resulted in a program that promotes teaching as a decision-making process.

The goal of the collaborative program is to prepare student teachers and interns to function as effective classroom teachers in a multicultural urban setting. The development of human communication skills and multicultural perspectives necessary to function effectively with parents, students, and other professionals within this community of learners is emphasized.

Following the planning year (1988-89), which was funded by the Ford Foundation and the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching, the PSD/UC operated at two Pittsburgh public high schools during the 1989-90 pilot year, also funded by a Ford Foundation grant. Langley High School is the site for student teachers, most of whom are drawn from Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Schenley High School Teacher Center housed the intern site for students from Duquesne University and the University of Pittsburgh.

During the 1990-91 school year, four urban high schools are participating in the program: Carrick High School, Langley High School, Schenley High School, and George Westinghouse High School. All sites, except Langley High School, provide clinical experiences for student teachers and interns.

A new governance structure exists. An Operation Committee determines many of the programmatic details, an Executive Committee determines policy and handles financial concerns, and a General Assembly feeds information and concerns to both groups.

Currently, interns and student teachers are recruited and selected through a standardized process. All clinical instructors are trained, and technical feedback is to be given to interns and student teachers at least three times per week.

Groups comprised of both basic and higher education personnel in specific subject areas meet to determine what content specific pedagogy interns and student teachers should be able to demonstrate by the end of their clinical experience.

PUBLICATIONS:

A Report on the Pittsburgh School District/ University Collaborative. (no charge)
School District/University Collaborative, 1989-90. (no charge)

CONTACT PERSON:

Dr. Judy Johnston, Director
Pittsburgh School District/University Collaborative
c/o Schenley High School Teacher Center
Centre Avenue & Bigelow Boulevard
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 622-8480

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

GRANTEE: The University of Washington

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS:

College Place Middle School, Edmonds School District
646 students in grades 7 and 8. An outcome-based education school, selected as a Washington "School for the 21st Century."

Albert Einstein Middle School, Shoreline School District
695 students in grades 7 and 8. A school known for its excellence in programs in the arts and for its long-term involvement in University of Washington teacher education programs.

Meany Middle School, Seattle School District
560 students in grades 6, 7, and 8. An urban school with a richly diverse student body and programs for students with special needs.

Odle Middle School, Bellevue School District
610 students in grades 6, 7, and 8. A middle school housing several alternative program options.

LENGTH OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS:

Field experiences for student teachers run throughout the teacher preparation programs. Elementary-certified students spend four quarters in the field (6 hours a week; half-time; full-time).

NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS PER YEAR:

1990-91, 14
1991-92 (planned), 28-30
Two to five students placed at each school.

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS: Total 20

College Place Middle School	4
Einstein Middle School	4
Meany Middle School	2
Odle Middle School	10

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A collaboratively planned and implemented postbaccalaureate program for middle school teachers is offered through the Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PSPDC). Now in its second year, the program provides student teachers with a knowledge base directly linked to the needs of middle school teachers, e.g., interdisciplinary curriculum, team teaching, early adolescent development. Students enroll in some traditional courses required for either elementary or secondary certificates, but four other courses have been integrated across two quarters to result in a 12-credit core seminar. That core seminar is team taught by professors of curriculum and instruction, special education, and educational psychology, and by a teaching associate drawn from among the master teachers of the four collaborating middle schools.

The student teachers combine course work with extensive field experiences at one of the participating schools. They are placed in team situations wherever possible, and, therefore, often work with at least two cooperating teachers. The field experience begins in their first quarter with six hours of observation and participation. It increases to half-time, then to full-time. Student teachers spend some time at one or more of the four participating schools, as well as at schools for students with special needs. They are encouraged to participate in colloquia, study groups, and other special professional growth activities at the site schools.

Supervision of the student teachers is done by site supervisors—master teachers from the sites who have been given training in supervision, and who are provided time during the school day (either through an allocated period or through use of substitute teachers) to meet with, observe, and evaluate the student teachers. A university graduate assistant works with the four site supervisors and shares the evaluation role with them during the 1990-91 school year (as they are learning their new role).

PUBLICATIONS:

Brochures about the PSPDC middle school preparation program and about the Center are available on request.

CONTACT PERSONS:

Dr. Nathalie J. Gehrke, PSPDC Director
Ms. Janet McDaniel, Middle School Program Coordinator
115 Miller Hall, DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195
(206) 543-5390

APPENDIX C

CLINICAL SCHOOLS CLEARINGHOUSE (CSC)

PURPOSE:

- To collect information related to clinical schools (also known as professional development schools and professional practice schools).
- To make this information accessible to clinical schools personnel, researchers, students, policymakers, teachers, and others.
- To produce literature on clinical schools.

ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS:

- CSC is funded by the Ford Foundation and is a joint project of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the AACTE/Ford Clinical Schools Project. The funding period was from January to December 1991.
- The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education administers and houses CSC

ACTIVITIES:

- Acquire documents, journal articles, and other materials related to clinical schools.
- Abstract, index, and process appropriate literature for the ERIC data base.
- Conduct outreach activities that inform the education community about and encourage use of CSC.
- Produce literature reviews, bibliographies, monographs, and other publications on significant clinical schools issues.
- Develop vocabulary to facilitate searching for related literature in the ERIC data base.

PUBLICATIONS:

- *Professional Development Schools: Toward a New Relationship for Schools and Universities*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education Trends and Issues Paper No. 3, by Raphael O. Nystrand (1991)
- *Professional Development School Projects*, Mini-Bibliography No. 1 (1991)
- *Collaboration Within the Context of Professional Development Schools*, Mini-Bibliography No. 2 (1991)
- *Professional Development Schools: Principles and Concepts*, Mini-Bibliography No. 3 (1991)
- *The Nature of Professional Development Schools*, ERIC Digest 89-4 (1989)

- *Professional Development Schools and Educational Reform: Concepts and Concerns*, ERIC Digest 91-2 (1991)
- *Professional Development Schools and the Professionalization of Teaching*, ERIC Digest (forthcoming)

CONTACT PERSON:

Ismat Abdal-Haqq, Coordinator
Clinical Schools Clearinghouse
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
(202) 293-2450

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186
Phone 202/293-2450 ■ Fax 202/457-8095